HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXXVII OCTOBER, 1944 NUMBER 4

NIEBUHR'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

N. P. JACOBSON

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 237

PART I 238

Niebuhr's philosophy of history
Presuppositions
Super-history
Evidence for super-history
Significance of empirical data
History
Nature of super-history
Recapitulation
Verification

PART II 255

A few critical remarks
Niebuhr and 'ideology'
Man's transcendence
Niebuhr's obscurantism

PART III 261

A naturalistic interpretation
A correlate for super-history
Progressive development of meaning in history
Meaning surviving in the midst of defeat
A reliable basis for hope
Conclusion

INTRODUCTION

THIS paper* is a study of the second volume of The Nature and Destiny of Man with a view to deriving Niebuhr's philosophy

* A critique of Niebuhr's philosophy of history in Volume II of The Nature and Destiny of Man, together with a naturalistic interpretation of the same data to which Niebuhr appeals.

of history. It may be said that the one thing which Niebuhr has uppermost in mind is to set forth such a philosophy of history; we shall attempt to catch it within the scope of this paper, and having delineated the structure in its main elements, we shall criticize it from the point of view of Christian Naturalism and attempt a constructive interpretation of our own.

In a real sense it is true that an investigation of Niebuhr's philosophy of history would entail the proportions of a large volume, for it is true that everything he says has some significance for this aspect of his thought. It will not be possible within the limits of this paper to do more than to select some of the most crucial elements for examination. It will probably be claimed that we have selected such features as lend themselves to a naturalistic interpretation, that we have neglected some highly important details. In a measure the first claim will be true of any critique of Niebuhr, for he lends himself to a variety of interpretations. He is obscure and paradoxical; he resists any attempt to resolve these paradoxes. To this extent there is possible a wide difference of interpretation; Niebuhr is like a dark, unruffled pool in which a variety of things may be seen reflected, depending upon what one is prepared to find. We hope, however, that we have caught the main outline of a philosophy of history to which the author, himself, would assent.

Part I

NIEBUHR'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

On Presuppositions. The natural point at which to begin a description of Niebuhr's interpretation of history is to set forth in systematic order the author's presuppositions. Every structure of thought has its foundation in peculiar materials accepted more or less unwittingly. To uncover such elements in Niebuhr, however, would be a task equal at least to the scope of our present work; for it would entail a careful scrutiny and

analysis of both cultural and psychological elements which have influenced the thought of our author. There may be in fact no way of knowing for certain another's presuppositions; it is no part of the present work, at any rate, to psychoanalyze Niebuhr, and we shall attempt to refrain from imputing to him what he does not actually say.

The natural starting point, therefore, is to set forth the author's admitted presuppositions. "The interpretation which is being attempted in these pages is based on Christian presuppositions. The Christian answer to the problem of life is assumed in the discussion of the problem." [1] What these Christian presuppositions are is not so clear; but we shall be on relatively safe ground if we characterize Niebuhr's philosophy of history as set consciously over against two alternative interpretations, one attempting to find the meaning of life within the historical process, the other turning away from history to find whatever meaning there is existing entirely and exclusively in a non-spatial, non-temporal reality. Against these two alternatives, Niebuhr finds the key to the meaning of history in the revelation of God which is in Christ. The narrow span of years at the beginning of the present era is the keystone in the arch of history. "History after Christ is an interim between the disclosure of its true meaning and the fulfillment of that meaning." [2] Were it not for this period which saw the rise of the Christian religion, mankind would have no basis for discovering the significance of human living. The Christian tradition is the norm, the later interpretations throwing more and more light on the original revelation in Christ.

> Christ as the disclosure of the character of God and the meaning of history . . . (*a*) completes what is incomplete in their apprehensions of meaning; (*b*) it clarifies obscurities which threaten the sense of meaning; and (*c*) it finally corrects falsifications of meaning which human egoism introduces into the sense of meaning by reason of its effort to comprehend the whole of life from an inadequate centre of comprehension.[3]

[1] Reinhold Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, Volume II (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943), p. 6.

[2] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 49.

[3] Ibid., p. 81.

Instead of looking away from history to another order of existence, instead of finding the full meaning of history within the temporal process, Niebuhr sees in Christ the foundation upon which one might stand to see the direction in which history will be fulfilled.

There are other aspects of Niebuhr's Biblicism which might be treated as presuppositions accepted with scriptural authority, aspects which our author would evidently affirm as having the status of presuppositions. We mention three: (1) that God suffers, (2) that God is both immanent and transcendent in and over the world, and (3) that God judges the whole human enterprise. We might go further to phrase presuppositions regarding other customary Christian concepts. But we pause at this juncture to note that it is conceivable that Niebuhr is not consciously presupposing elements of orthodox Christian belief. It is conceivable, for example, that Niebuhr thinks that his treatment of super-history rests entirely upon the basis of empirical data to which we shall refer below. The present writer believes, to be sure, that Niebuhr accepts the orthodox belief in a ground called Eternity for all that exists in time, but we hesitate to credit the author with this assumption, for it is possible that he might disagree and emphasize that his whole picture rests upon an empirical basis.

We intend to be faithful to Niebuhr by accepting as presuppositions, therefore, only what are clearly such. That Christ is final in revealing the mind of God and the meaning of history, that God is both immanent and transcendent in and over the world, that God judges the whole human enterprise, and that God suffers — these are the important presuppositions. These we believe the author would concede. We shall not be unfaithful if we rest our case at this point with respect to the presuppositions which lie behind his philosophy of history.

Super-history. We have already said that we shall treat this feature in the sense that it is based upon empirical data rather than as a presupposition. We shall build the case for super-history, displaying as Niebuhr does the various empirical evidences which point to this source of meaning and which point to the possible characteristics which super-history can be

expected to possess. All of the evidence designated is empirical data on which Niebuhr bases his philosophy of history. We wish to draw attention, therefore, to these numerous evidences; they are the important bricks out of which our author constructs his edifice. We might further remark that we shall employ these same empirical facts later in our study, attempting to interpret them from a naturalistic point of view with entirely different results.

It may be held that each of the elements which we treat below is but a manifestation of the transcendence of man over the flux of the temporal process. It might be said that each of these elements speaks of one central fact; namely, the expression of the transcendent in man. Indeed, this is precisely what we believe to be the author's meaning. With this in view we treat super-history first, for it is evident that Niebuhr's entire philosophy of history is erected upon his concept of super-history and its rôle in the progress of meaning. Super-history is the foundation of man's historical existence, standing above and beyond and lending meaning and completion to the obscurities of life. How this is viewed by Niebuhr will be clear as we proceed.

Empirical data employed as evidence for super-history. In the following manifestations, super-history expresses itself in man, forcing man to take it into account. In all of these ways the transcendence of man over temporal existence is evidenced.

1. Man can look before and after and dream of what is not.
2. Man realizes his own finiteness.
3. Man can extricate himself from the causal forces in history sufficiently to achieve freedom.
4. All the meanings of history are fragmentary and frustrated in time.
5. Man has a sense of failure to fulfill the absolute demands of God; this sense issues from the image of God which is in him.
6. Man looks forward with anxiety to the end of history and to death.
7. History is involved in conflicts which appear on each successive cultural level and are never escaped.
8. The sacrificial love which was manifested in Christ points to super-history.

It is possible to place different meanings upon such experiential fact; we will now endeavor to give Niebuhr's interpretation of

the data listed above. We have said that he believes all of these points to be evidence of a transcendent reality expressing itself in man. The documentary evidence will be allowed to build this case.

> A suprahistorical eternity is implied in history because the capacity by which man transcends temporal sequence, while yet being involved in it, implies a capacity of transcendence which is not limited by the sequence.[4]
>
> For any rigorous examination of the problems of man in nature-history clearly reveals that history points beyond itself and that it does so by reason of the freedom and transcendence of the human spirit. It is never completely contained in, or satisfied by, the historical-natural process, no matter to what level this process may rise.[5]
>
> Professor Tillich's analysis of the thought which transcends all conditioned and finite thought . . . is a precise formulation of the ultimate self-transcendence of the human spirit, revealed in its capacity to understand its own finiteness.[6]

In this fashion Niebuhr sees the significance of man's ability to extricate himself from the rigid involvement in causal sequence in which lower animals are immersed. Of all living organisms, man alone can rise over the domination of causality, can lift himself to a higher vista from which to look down upon the past and into the future and contemplate his own finiteness. Man alone of all the animal kingdom is able to take a little of the past and a little of the future and hold it in the present in a "partial simultaneity." This will convince the most sincere sceptic that the present moment with its causal nexus is transcended in the sense that man comprehends more than the present moment.

Equally cogent empirical data are found among the anxieties and frustrations, the incompleteness and false absolutes, the tensions and ubiquitous conflicts, which are present on every level of cultural development. Man cannot believe that the full meaning of history can be found in these incomplete and remnant bits of significance. All of this is evidence to show that life cannot complete itself on the historical level, that these conflicts and inconsistencies are never resolved in history. And insofar as history cannot complete itself, insofar as the conflicts

[4] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 10.
[5] Ibid., p. 96.
[6] Ibid. (footnote), p. 218.

of history are never resolved, the concept of super-history is justified.

> Insofar as he is involved in history, the disclosure of life's meaning must come to him in history. Insofar as he transcends history the source of life's meaning must transcend history.[7]
>
> The conception of a 'last' judgment expresses Christianity's refutation of all ideas of history, according to which it is its own redeemer and is able by its process of growth and development, to emancipate man from the guilt and sin of his existence, and to free him from judgment.[8]

On the basis of this intrinsic incoherence of history, man knows history to require super-history and a transcendent God.

Of great importance to Niebuhr is man's sense of failure to achieve the demands of God, which might be otherwise stated as man's constant striving to correct his inadequacies, to surpass his accomplishments, to realize something ever more excellent than what has been achieved in the past. Others, pointing to this characteristic of man with the phrases 'divine unrest' or 'the capacity for being bored,' have found in this urge to greater fulfillment a source of creative behavior. Niebuhr interprets this unceasing striving to mean that man has an image of God within him, an image besmirched with sin, to be sure, but an image nevertheless, which is the source of this sense of failure to fulfill God's demands. This evidence of super-history man bears within him; God has placed in all men an ineradicable goodness which makes man restive in the midst of evil. Man is anxious about himself, feels the pressure of necessity against his own inadequateness.

Against this background of a residual goodness, Niebuhr interprets the Fall of Man. This image of God, which is the source of man's sense of failure to approximate the will of God, is, in a fallen state, corrupted with evil, submerged in the evils of the historical flux. This is the core of truth at which the Biblical symbol of the Fall aims; actually there never was a Fall, but there is a fallen image of God within man which suffices to prove man's citizenship in super-history. Niebuhr declares against the error of Barth's denial of this point of contact between man and eternity; [9] the footprints of God are in this claim of a higher goodness in man.

[7] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 36. [8] Ibid., p. 293. [9] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 64.

The expression of the transcendent is further revealed in man's fear of death.

> Because the fear of death springs from the capacity not only to anticipate death but to imagine and to be anxious about some dimension of reality on the other side of death. Both forms of fear prove man's transcendence over nature. His mind comprehends the point in nature at which his own existence in nature ends; and thereby proves that nature does not fully contain him. The fact that he fears extinction is a negative indication of a dimension in the human spirit, transcending nature. The fact that he is anxious about a possible realm of meaning on the other side of death, and speculates, in the words of Hamlet's soliloquy that 'to die, to sleep' may mean 'perchance to dream,' is the positive indication of man's freedom transcending nature. The fear of death is thus the clearest embryonic expression of man's capacity as a creator of history.[10]

Whether or not a fear of death actually demonstrates man's transcendence over the life and death cycle of natural phenomena we shall have occasion to discuss in our next section. It is important to see here that to Niebuhr this contemplation of one's own end shows in itself that there is something in man which enables him to reach beyond that end and to view the destruction of his own life from some vantage point in a transcendent eternity.

The point in Niebuhr's classification of empirical data which collects facts with regard to the conflicts present on every cultural level, from the primitive to the highest and most complex modern civilization, lends itself to a convincing interpretation of an historical flux hopelessly caught in unresolved tensions which renew the possibilities of savage wars on every level. That there will be 'wars and rumors of wars' to the end of time is a statement which can hardly be refuted on the basis of available evidence.

> Modern technical civilization is bringing all civilizations and cultures, all empires and nations into closer juxtaposition to each other. The fact that this greater intimacy and contiguity prompts tragic 'world wars' rather than some simple and easy interpenetration of cultures, must dissuade us from regarding a 'universal culture' or a 'world government' as the natural and inevitable TELOS which will give meaning to the whole historical process.[11]

Significance of the above empirical data. We have listed several divisions of experiential data which, according to Niebuhr,

[10] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 8.

[11] Ibid., p. 314.

demonstrate the pull of the transcendent upon man. All of these divisions are used to reveal the anomalous position of history suspended, as it were, between nature and super-history. The data set forth are open to common scientific verification, are found throughout history; they are not the possession of some esoteric group. All of this leads to Niebuhr's key statement, that history, full of obscurities and unfulfilled meanings, points beyond itself. History has its basis in super-history.

> There are elements in the 'behaviour' of history which point to this 'hidden' source of its life. It is in that sense that history is meaningful but pointing beyond itself.[12]

History. It will be useful to bring to a focus at this point what has been said with regard to history. It has been brought out in various ways that history is suspended, so to speak, between nature with its causal mechanism, and super-history with its free activity. History is the life of man both in his transcendence over nature and in his subjection to it. There is tension and stress in the life of man; he is caught in repeated contradictions; he is carried first one way and then another, pulled by the activity of super-history and by natural phenomena, each in turn, and often both simultaneously, being disclosed in the behavior of man.

History, therefore, has meaning; history is serious, however impotent it is when taken alone. History has this tremendous job to do; namely, to carry meaning.

One might mention that Niebuhr is not clear as to whether or not history will ultimately be gathered up in a final end of the temporal sequence. In some places it might seem as though he accepts the view of New Testament eschatology and sees history caught up and destroyed in a final act of God. But the author is obscure to such a degree that we would prefer to leave the matter undecided. The significant point, at any rate, is the seriousness of historical sequence, its rôle as a carrier of meaning, its pointing beyond itself to a completion and fulfillment in super-history, the hidden source of its life. "History moves between the limits of nature and eternity." [13]

[12] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 67.

[13] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 2.

On the nature of super-history. The empirical data assembled thus far point inconclusively to the existence of a realm which Niebuhr calls super-history. All of the evidence has demonstrated the fact that man transcends the natural and historical flux. The effort thus far has been to show that there is a basis outside history upon which history depends. As to the nature of this super-historical realm nothing yet has been said, save that it provides the foundation for such life and meaning as we find in the historical process. In any time and place, man can note the evidence which we have reviewed, can observe his own freedom over history. It is on this basis that Niebuhr makes the charge that wherever history is taken seriously a Christ is expected. For to Niebuhr the evidence points conclusively to the fact that history's incompleteness and irreconcilable conflict, man's anomalous suspension between time and eternity, his fear of death, his consciousness of failure to fulfill the demands upon him, his ability to look before and behind and to dream of what is not, and his ability to realize his own finiteness — all of this can point to one conclusion; namely, that there is another basis outside time where these inconsistencies and incomplete gropings are caught up and fulfilled. All of these items of man's experience, if taken seriously, should lead man to expect a Christ.

For the Christian, this resolution of the confusion of history, this invasion of the super-historical realm into history, is an accomplished fact. It is to Christ that Niebuhr looks for the key to the meaning of history, for in Christ God is revealed. In the person of Christ we have an insight into the nature of this super-historical realm the presence of which has been established. Christ verifies the conclusion at which we had arrived from an examination of history; Christ further reveals some of the characteristics of super-history.

> When this word of revelation (that is in Christ) is spoken, it completes incomplete knowledge insofar as human history is a realm of reality having its final basis in eternity. There are elements in the 'behaviour' of history which point to this 'hidden' source of its life. It is in that sense that history is meaningful but pointing beyond itself. Secondly, the word of revelation clarifies obscurities and contradictions in history. In that sense history is meaningful but its meaning is threatened by meaninglessness. Finally, the

'word' of God corrects falsifications which have been introduced into the human interpretations of life's meaning by reason of man's effort to explain history from the standpoint of himself as its center. In that sense the word of revelation stands in contradiction to human culture and is 'foolishness' to the wise. But precisely because it is such foolishness, transcending human wisdom, it becomes, once accepted, the basis for a satisfactory total explanation of life. It becomes truly wisdom. Revelation does not remain in contradiction to human culture and human knowledge. By completing the incompleteness, clarifying the obscurities and correcting the falsifications of human knowledge it becomes true wisdom to 'them that are called.' [14]

In this lengthy passage we see the significance of Christ. To any culture which takes history seriously, a Christ is expected; [15] but the inadequacies of human reason are such that even with superhistory revealed in the purity of Christ, man falters in his understanding of this significant event. Indeed, man fails to understand that Christ is actually that to which history directs attention, and a Christ is denied, treated as a conundrum, and crucified. A Christ is expected, but he is rejected, and only as the centuries wear on is man gradually able to see in that cataclysmic event its great meaning and importance.

At this point Niebuhr assembles another group of forceful empirical data. Since the advent of Christ, there have been present in the realm of history empirical facts which were missing before he appeared. This experiential data belong on a different level from facts with which we have been dealing, for these are not common property in the same sense. They are part of the experience only of that portion of mankind who accept Christ as a revelation of God. Christ becomes true wisdom to members of the inner circle of believers. For this reason we have separated the following empirical data which Niebuhr employs in the dual rôle of revealing the nature of super-history and of justifying committal to Christ. In addition to completing history's incompleteness, correcting falsifications of human interpretations, clarifying obscurities and becoming true wisdom to believers, Christ has done two things which, to be sure, cannot be separated from these elements just mentioned. He has (1) symbolized the divine nature of God in history through his sacrificial love upon the Cross, and (2)

[14] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 67.

[15] Ibid., p. 4.

opened a new channel of power in which God can work upon the man who accepts Christ.

(1) Under this category of sacrificial love, Niebuhr subsumes much which forces one to be more certain than ever with regard to the existence of super-history. Christ reveals the structure of super-history and dictates to man the norm by which he shall live, without regard to the impossibility of fulfilling the norm within history. Christ reveals that God is not far removed, that God is actively involved in the historical process, and against this revelation of God's nature, Christ shows man to be a sinner. Man can strive within history but fails to live according to sacrificial love. Mutual love is the highest level which history can attain. It is left for super-history to justify fully the divine 'agape.' Man, after Christ, becomes more convinced as to his own paradoxical and anomalous situation as a citizen of two realms of being.

> The agape, the sacrificial love, which is for Christian faith revealed upon the Cross, has its primary justification in an 'essential reality' which transcends the realities of history, namely, the character of God. It does not expect an immediate or historical validation but looks towards some ultimate consummation of life and history. . . . (But there are) validations of agape in actual history, insofar as concern for the other actually elicits a reciprocal response.[16]

In revealing the nature of God, Christ with his sacrificial Cross emphasizes the truth of what has been gathered from other facts, that the conflicts of history cannot be resolved apart from the level of super-history. Christ furnishes additional proof that the destiny of man transcends history, that only in God can man find a surcease from his incompleteness. The divine 'agape' promises that there is a final supremacy of love over the forces of egoism which defy the demands of super-history. The fact that this revelation of the nature of God went down in defeat amid the conflicting jealousies of historical interests furnishes evidence of the divine derivation of this Christian Cross. Had the Christ been successful in the clash of historical interests, it would then have been plain that here was but another side of human history which conquered in the clash of human

[16] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 96.

rivalries. But in the apparent defeat, the divine 'agape' demonstrates the paradoxical love of God which is not the love of man and which can be revealed within history only by a disavowal of power.[17] "The Cross symbolizes the perfection of 'agape' which transcends all particular norms of justice and mutuality in history." [18] "The final justification for the way of 'agape' in the New Testament is never found in history." [19]

To declare, as Jesus does, that the Messiah, the representative of God, must suffer, is to make vicarious suffering the final revelation of meaning in history. But it is the vicarious suffering of the representative of God, and not of some force in history, which finally clarifies the obscurities of history and discloses the sovereignty of God over history.[20]

It is impossible to symbolize the divine goodness in history in any other way than by complete powerlessness, or rather by a consistent refusal to use power in the rivalries of history.[21]

We find Niebuhr referring again and again to this divine love in the Cross of Christ, remarking time after time that in this act of God history is clearly set over against super-history and shown its divine foundation.

The perfection of 'agape' as symbolized in the Cross can neither be simply reduced to the limits of history, nor yet dismissed as irrelevant because it transcends history. It transcends history as history transcends itself. It is the final norm of a human nature which has no final norm in history because it is not completely contained in history.[22]

In this historical appearance of Christ and in his sacrificial death upon the Cross, super-history is revealed both in its nature and as a fact. Vicarious suffering is the final revelation of meaning in history, and it is the vicarious suffering of God.

To be sure, all that Niebuhr says with regard to this divine love can be said only as and by one who has accepted Christ as a final revelation of God. To the rest of men, Christ, as an historical person who went down to miserable defeat in an apparent act of sacrificial love, is a matter of historical fact. But to the believer the divine revelation of sacrificial love in the Cross becomes related to mutual human love as the counterpart of the relationship between super-history and history.

[17] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 74.
[18] Ibid., p. 74.
[19] Ibid., p. 88.
[20] Ibid., p. 45.
[21] Ibid., p. 72.
[22] Ibid., p. 75.

(2) In opening a new channel of power between God and man, Christ initiates other empirical data for the believer. Niebuhr finds a power present in history, a power which Christians call 'grace,' which issues into individual lives bringing an electrifying release of energy to the pent-up apathy of an isolated personality shut within selfish interests.

> The Christian experience of the new life is an experience of a new selfhood. The new self is more truly a real self because the vicious circle of self-centredness has been broken. The self lives in and for others, in the general orientation of loyalty to, and love of, God; who alone can do justice to the freedom of the self over all partial interests and values. This new self is the real self; for the self is infinitely self-transcendent; and any premature centring of itself around its own interests, individually or collectively, destroys and corrupts its freedom.[23]

The power which lifts the individual out of his preoccupation with the interests of group or race functions further to direct his eyes to the genuine source of all life, super-history. As such, this power called 'grace' is another empirical fact – but only to the believer, as in the case of sacrificial love. This power, however, which issues into the Christian selfhood, completes the characterization of super-history, for we see here the great activity of God on the level of the historical struggle. This 'grace' further completes the incompleteness of history's anomalous situation, for in this power of God upon the believer one sees the wisdom and truth in Christ with an impact which justifies the believer in his leap of faith. This activity of God which is included in the Christian idea of 'grace' means power, wisdom, and truth. Through 'grace' God completes what man cannot complete, gives man new meaning, new life, new capacity to win over the blocking influence which history exerts upon his growth.

> The Christian gospel . . . enters the world with the proclamation that in Christ both 'wisdom' and 'power' are available to man; which is to say that not only has the true meaning of life been disclosed but also that resources have been made available to fulfill that meaning.[24]
>
> Grace represents on the one hand the mercy and forgiveness of God by which He completes what man cannot complete and overcomes the sinful elements in all of man's achievements. Grace is the power of God over man.

[23] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 110.

[24] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 98.

Grace is on the other hand the power of God in man; it represents an accession of resources, which man does not have of himself, enabling him to become what he truly ought to be.[25]

This power of 'grace,' in fact, raises the believer to a new level of selfhood, the genuine level in which man reaches his true character.

The real self has a height of spiritual freedom which reaches beyond race and nation and which is closer to the eternal than the more earthbound collective entities of man's history. Such demonic possession therefore destroys and blunts the real self (i.e. intense nationalisms) and reduces it to the dimensions of nature.[26]

And in raising man above the conflicts and destructions of historical existence, this new power of God in the believer brings a new outlook upon life, enables man to live upon a new basis, brings a new meaning and thrill to life. "Once faith is induced, it becomes truly the wisdom which makes 'sense' out of a life and history which would otherwise remain senseless." [27] This 'grace' gives one a new vantage point above history, from which to view the conflicts in a new light. "From such a vantage point history is meaningful, even if it should be impossible to discern any unity in its continuing conflicts." [28]

Recapitulation. We have outlined very briefly Niebuhr's interpretation of history. He admits presuppositions with regard to the finality of Christ, a God who suffers and judges the human enterprise, and a God both immanent in and transcendent over the realm of history. With these presuppositions he goes on to gather data from history which point to the existence and nature of super-history. It is entirely possible that he accepts this realm of eternity as a presupposition, but we have chosen to avoid this issue and to assemble the empirical data as our author has done, allowing him to build the structure of super-history and to see its significance over and beyond the historical flux. The important categories in which Niebuhr seems to assemble this experiential data for super-history all testify to the pull of the transcendent upon man. They demonstrate how man is gripped by eternity. The empirical facts

[25] Ibid., p. 98.
[26] Ibid., p. 111.
[27] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 206.
[28] Ibid., p. 307.

are gathered from wide areas of experience; we have grouped them under divisions such as man's fear of death and of what is beyond, man's consciousness of irreconcilable conflict and recurring frustration within history, man's ability to realize his own finiteness, his ability to take a little of the past with a little of the future and to hold these in a 'partial simultaneity,' and man's sense of failure to attain the requirements which life places upon him. All of these we have described as facts of experience to which Niebuhr gives his Christian interpretation, showing how they cause one to look from the incompleteness of history to Christ and to see some external basis for what meaning history conveys.

After building such a case for the existence of super-history, Niebuhr shows Christ to be the key to the meaning of history in two major ways, (1) that he reveals the nature of God as sacrificial love, and (2) that he opens a new channel of power between God and man which the Christian calls 'grace,' a channel bringing power, wisdom, and knowledge to the believer. These two major results of the coming of Christ with his revelation of God serve to verify further the existence of super-history and to acquaint us with the nature of this non-spatial, non-temporal reality. Christ reveals that which does not make sense from a purely human point of view. Although a Christ is expected, he refutes the expectation while he fulfills it, leading us to think that there must be another reality from which this revelation of God issues. The sacrificial love which Christ reveals is defeated in the strife of historical interests, but it is, nevertheless, the norm by which God judges the human enterprise; it is a command to live as a citizen of super-history without regard to the apparent defeat and irreconcilable conflict in which such commitment involves one.

It will be helpful to remind ourselves in this summary statement that Niebuhr is not exceptionally clear in his treatment of questions which immediately arise with regard to super-history. One might like to know with more detail the nature of this eternity; such a desire for intellectual clarity is not met by Niebuhr. We might say that his interest is mainly a practical one of depicting the conditions of salvation, and if we ask

him for more definite descriptions of eternity, we get no reply. It is the opinion of the present writer, however, that Niebuhr has the general view of absolute idealism with regard to eternity. In the treatment which faces the matter most adequately, he couples eternity with the 'total simultaneity' of the divine mind.

> Eternity stands over time on the one hand and at the end of time on the other. It stands over time in the sense that it is the ultimate source and power of all derived and dependent existence. It is not a separate order of existence; for this reason the traditional connotation of the concept, 'supernatural,' is erroneous. The eternal is the ground and source of the temporal. The divine consciousness gives meaning to the mere succession of natural events by comprehending them simultaneously, even as human consciousness gives meaning to segments of natural sequence by comprehending them simultaneously in memory and foresight.[29]

But it is yet not clear wherein his view differs from any reputable supernaturalistic view of eternity. Only the innocent and illiterate can in our day be said to think of a many-storied universe with eternity occupying a separate order of existence. Any credited supernaturalist would deny such naïveté.

It is probably close to the truth if we should merely say that Niebuhr accepts the concept of eternity along with some other ideas of the Christian tradition, such as the resurrection, eschatology, etc., without stopping to inquire into the difficulties involved or to attempt to answer the problems which immediately arise. His treatment of the resurrection is especially open to such a claim; for there is no more than a blurred picture of this important orthodox position. Due to his overwhelming interest in practical matters of sin and salvation, Niebuhr seems to accept such ideas uncritically. He esteems the religious view of scripture and wants to hold on to whatever of it that he can. In the matter of eternity the issue is one of recognizing the demand for a standpoint aloof from the relativism of every point in cultural history, a point on which to stand in reviewing the passing parade. If Niebuhr disavows the cognomen 'supernaturalist,' we must, on the other hand, insist upon classifying him in such a category. The unsavory connotations which are

[29] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 299.

coming to be associated with the supernaturalist position can only be avoided by altering the position itself.

Testing the hypothesis. We have already had occasion to observe that the Christian interpretation of history which Niebuhr gives purports to be self-justifying. He has given a philosophy of history based upon scripture. He has found in Christ the hope and fulfillment, the promise and resolution, of the historical meanderings in which mankind is emerged. He makes it clear — indeed we should say that this is his point of greatest emphasis — that to the believer Christ brings the good news of salvation.

> There is no experience which points irrefutably to the particular divine ground and end of history which Christian faith discerns in Christ and the Cross. In the realm of ethics as in the realm of truth, the revelation of Christ is foolishness, in the sense that experience does not lead us to expect or anticipate the answer which it makes to the ethical problem. But it is 'wisdom to them that are called' in the sense that, once accepted, it becomes an adequate principle for interpreting the ethical problem in history. It is the only principle of interpretation which does justice to the two factors in the human situation: man's involvement in natural process, including the imperative character of his natural impulse of survival; and his transcendence over natural process, including his uneasy conscience over the fact that the survival impulse should play so dominant a role in all his ethical calculations.[30]

History validates the Christian solution to the anomalous predicament of mankind. Accepted on faith, Christ and his revelation become the truth for the believer, illumining events and being in turn validated by experience.[31] An accession of power, furthermore, issues into the life of the believer; the individual is lifted above the egoistic frustrations in which history is involved and becomes a channel through which the resources of super-history may find expression. Accept Christ and super-history lays hold upon you and you experience salvation as an accession of the power of God. The individual who gives his whole being to Christ, accepting the revelation of God which is in Christ, undergoes certain definite experiences which validate the whole structure of the Christian hypothesis. We agree that the word 'hypothesis' is one which hardly fits the situa-

[30] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 97.
[31] Ibid., p. 63.

tion, for there is none of the element of probability in the mind of one who accepts Christ in the manner described. On the other, the experiences to which the Christian can point validate his belief in Christ and in this sense we employ the term.

> The self is shattered whenever it is confronted by the power and holiness of God and becomes genuinely conscious of the real source and centre of all life. In Christian faith Christ mediates the confrontation of the self by God; for it is in Christ that the vague sense of the divine, and human life never loses this, is crystallized into a revelation of a divine mercy and judgment. In that revelation, fear of judgment and hope of mercy are so mingled that despair induces repentance and repentance hope.[32]

To such an individual, the Christian faith in Christ is self-justifying. For Niebuhr this offers evidence that the fruits of his philosophy of history, from a pragmatic standpoint of noting the consequences in terms of human behavior, validate the entire structure which he has created.

Part II

A FEW CRITICAL REMARKS

It will be necessary to introduce in this category of critical remarks only a very small portion of what might be said. We shall not claim for these remarks, therefore, a complete evaluation of Niebuhr's philosophy of history. For there enter here problems which would break the bounds of our present task. There is, for example, the entire question of the relationship between Niebuhr's interpretation and the modern treatment of scripture. It will be clear to one acquainted with varieties of Biblical criticism that most of their discoveries are entirely neglected by our author. There seems to be no effort to distinguish in the scriptures the reliable from the less reliable, no attempt to use the results of 'higher' and 'lower' criticism as a means for deriving the core of early Christian teaching and belief. But to criticize Niebuhr from this point of view would be a task in itself.

We select, therefore, several elements of our author's inter-

[32] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 109.

pretation of history and subject them to analysis and criticism. We shall group our remarks under three main headings, (1) Niebuhr and 'ideology,' (2) man's transcendence, and (3) the author's obscurantism, his love for paradox, his irrationalism.

(1) It is apparent to the present writer that Niebuhr is acutely aware of the pitfalls which beset one who attempts to absolutize his views; he has investigated much of the literature on the subject, is acquainted with the work of Mannheim, scorns the blind 'ideology' of the Marxian interpretation of history, has surveyed the new science of Sociology of Knowledge. Yet, despite this awareness of danger, Niebuhr walks into the very trap which he has carefully surveyed. He has a good case against the claim of finality which men invariably make for their finite perspectives. They hide the taint of interest and passion which infects their knowledge; they deny the finiteness of their view. But this lash against 'ideologies' can be turned on Niebuhr with equal force. To be sure, he thinks to avoid this predicament which has ensnared others:

> The Christian answer to the problem of ideological taint in our knowledge is the apprehension of the truth 'in Christ.' This is a truth about life and history which fulfills what is valid and negates what is sinful in our knowledge of the truth. It is possible to accept this truth despite, and because of, its contradiction of all sinful truth. By such acceptance the believer is lifted in principle above the egoistic corruptions of the truth in history.[33]

The point at issue is another on which Niebuhr, himself, is not very certain, for in another place he affirms that even such grace as is manifested in Christian life does not lift men above the finiteness of the mind nor yet save them from the sin of claiming to have transcended it.[34] It might be held in this context that Niebuhr is probably the best example of this statement that Christian grace does not save men from making such grandiose claims. It is odd, indeed, how he deals with this problem of 'ideology.' He feels the evil of claiming Biblical authority, too, in absolutizing one's views:

> The certain conviction of the faithful that the Bible gave them the final truth, transcending all finite perspectives and all sinful corruptions, thus

[33] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 215.
[34] Ibid., p. 219.

contributed to individual spiritual arrogance, no less intolerable than the collective arrogance of the older church. This pride expressed itself despite the fact that contrary interpretations of scripture, against which the arrogance was directed, contradicted the pretension of an absolutely valid interpretation.[35]

Further, our author lashes out against making the Bible stand behind other phases of cultural interpretation.

When the Bible becomes an authoritative compendium of social, economic, political and scientific knowledge, it is used as a vehicle of the sinful sanctification of relative standards of knowledge and virtue which happen to be enshrined in a religious canon.[36]

A modern scientific viewpoint of scripture would make it possible to retort that Niebuhr is using the Bible in a manner for which it was never intended and is guilty along with these whom he here condemns. It is certain that the Bible was never meant to teach a philosophy of history.

It may be interesting to list some of Niebuhr's paradoxical remarks relative to the present discussion of 'ideology.'

No elaboration of philosophy or science can carry us beyond the truth which is contained in the gospel.[37]

All known facts of history verify the interpretation of human destiny implied in New Testament eschatology.[38]

The Biblical symbols cannot be taken literally because it is not possible for finite minds to comprehend that which transcends and fulfills history. The finite mind can only use symbols and pointers of the character of the eternal.[39]

Rightly conceived, Scriptural authority is meant merely to guard the truth of the Gospel in which all truth is fulfilled and all corruptions of truth are negated. This authority is Scriptural in the sense that the Bible contains the history, and the culmination in Christ, of that 'Heilsgeschichte' in which the whole human enterprise becomes fully conscious of its limits, of its transgressions of those limits, and of the divine answer to its problems.[40]

Statements such as these cause one to wonder how to deal with Niebuhr. He realizes the pitfalls of claiming finality for one's view; he deprecates any attempt to bolster one's views in a final manner even upon Scriptural authority. One wonders what to think of a man who seems to realize the mistakes of all manner of other absolutisms and then leaps in the precise di-

[35] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 229.
[36] Ibid., p. 152.
[37] Ibid., p. 208.
[38] Ibid., p. 319.
[39] Ibid., p. 289.
[40] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 152.

rection in which he has seen great danger. Niebuhr appears to find in the Reformation and its emphasis upon 'justification by faith' a lifesaver on which he might float his own interpretation.

> This doctrine which appears so irrelevant to modern men . . . represents the final renunciation in the heart of Christianity of the human effort to complete life and history, whether with or without divine grace.[41]

The source of the confusion here may be the lack of any clear understanding of faith. Niebuhr seems to rob the concept of any content whatever, and yet he fills it in other places with his own particular interpretation of history. His ambition is to avoid the relativisms of every cultural setting with its special interests, problems, and meanings, and he thinks to accomplish this ambition by a queer treatment of an obscure faith.

> It must be emphasized that this final revelation of the divine sovereignty over life and this final disclosure of the meaning of life in terms of its dependence upon the divine judgment and mercy is not simply some truth of history which is comprehended by reason, to be added to the sum total of human knowledge. It must be constantly apprehended inwardly by faith, because it is a truth which transcends the human situation in each individual just as it transcended the total cultural situation historically.[42]

We should be tempted to deny that this scriptural event of Christ transcended either the human or cultural situation, historically. And it is very difficult to apprehend what seems to be mere emptiness — if this is what 'faith' means in the above passage.

We believe that it would be more worthwhile and certainly more intelligible for Niebuhr to admit that his interpretation, too, of the Biblical narrative is another view of this crucial historical event which has meant many things to many people. It seems clear that nothing is to be gained, henceforth, by claiming finality for one's interpretation, however sanctified it might be by the Holy Spirit. We believe, too, that historical perspectives are not all of one piece, that distinctions need to be made, that whereas there is no point of view which can claim finality, there are some which account better for the facts than do others. Where Niebuhr fails to distinguish between the more and the

[41] Ibid., p. 148.
[42] Ibid., p. 57.

less of partial views, it seems that he has failed to see an important distinction. The rôle of the person is now recognized in all knowledge, and truth of all sorts cannot parade abroad without the mark of its proclaimer. The human element cannot be eliminated in knowledge; we must give up the attempt to attain some transcendent point in the universe from which to view the human panorama; we must recognize that the taint of human interest and passion is eliminated, if only partially, by a close sifting of evidence in a public investigation. From different directions peculiar biases converge upon various cultural data; we can check out the element of bias to an ever-increasing extent. But we renounce any ambition to divest human knowledge of its human element of interest and passion, for it is incredible that any relevant human creed could be freed from such an anthropomorphic thread.

(2) With regard to man's transcendence, it is clear that Niebuhr has a very restricted view of nature. If one adheres to a modern naturalism, holding values, ideals, purposes, ambitions, and other elevating aspects of human behavior to be a part of the natural scene of spatial and temporal forces, one will be loath to attribute to man some transcending power by which he participates in another realm of being. We believe that it is possible to explain most of the empirical data employed by Niebuhr without resorting to a reality outside of space and time. The next section will be the occasion for this task.

At this time we might mention that language, alone, seems to offer a better explanation for some elements of man's transcendence than does the super-history which Niebuhr employs. Language enables man to enter the experience of the past, to transcend the experience of any moment by holding a bit of the past and some of the future in a present 'partial simultaneity.' The present is transcended, to be sure, but this is far from catapulting man beyond the scope of time and space. Language enables civilization to cumulate meaning and to carry its past along with it. But language is a natural phenomenon and can be explained without recourse to super-history.

Likewise, the transcendence which Niebuhr infers from man's

fear of death seems to exhibit a falsification of empirical data. Man's fear of death would seem to be more of a dread or unwillingness felt at the aspect of breaking ties of fellowship and love among which he finds his reason for living. It is an unwillingness to part company with the social relationships which have come to focus in him to make him all that he is or hopes to be. An inarticulate unwillingness to die may, after all, express man's gratitude for the social environment. It is doubtful if man would fear death in any other sense in a culture which displayed an utter absence of ideas of Judgment in a life beyond the grave. It may also be said that death is actually welcomed by large numbers of humanity. To some life offers little to cause them to wish to keep alive the spark of life. Death is a blessing to many of the underprivileged.

It will be more apparent in our next chapter how Niebuhr's appeal to the transcendent is not the only possible interpretation of the facts which he offers.

(3) The obscurantism of our author might provide a complete study of its own. His love for paradox can be seen at work elevating absurdities to some more worthy level. Human reason suffers in this treatment, and the force of Niebuhr's entire work is weakened. For if human reason at once provides the only means of communicating meaning and on the other hand cannot be trusted, we are left in a blind alley, indeed. Of course, Niebuhr has no intention of destroying the credibility of reason any farther than is necessary to discredit opposing views. He conveys meaning and makes tremendous statements.

> The Christian faith knows it to be impossible for man or for any of man's historical achievements to transcend the unity and tension between the natural and the eternal in human existence.[43]

The limit which is applied to reason seems to be purely arbitrary.

> It is not possible to give a fuller or more plausible account of what is implied in the Christian hope for the fulfillment of life; and it is well to remember that the conditions of finiteness make a more explicit definition of the consummation impossible.[44]

[43] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 296.

[44] Ibid., p. 298.

Just enough reason — yet only enough to bring the meaning which our author intends to convey.

A complete criticism of Niebuhr's philosophy of history would take us farther afield than we are prepared to go within the limits of this paper. We shall turn, then, to our remaining task, that of grounding an entirely different interpretation of history upon the same empirical facts which we have observed in Niebuhr's appeal to experience.

Part III

A NATURALISTIC INTERPRETATION

Our present undertaking is not an ambitious one. We shall do no more than indicate the general direction in which a naturalistic interpretation of history would be developed. We shall confine our remarks mainly to three main features of the philosophy of history which we have been discussing. The most important results which Niebuhr has accomplished can be grouped under three heads:

(1) He has accounted for the progressive development of meaning in history.
(2) He has struggled with the evidence for a 'bounce-back' in history, a survival of meaning in the midst of defeat, an emergence of the new from the ashes of the old.
(3) He faces the problem of sacrificial love and its apparent frustrations in history, tracing it to a divine 'agape' which issues from super-history.

The solution of these great problems of history Niebuhr finds in his treatment of super-history. We have seen that eternity provides the explanation for the progressive development of meaning in history and for the survival of meaning amid apparent defeat. History, because of what issues forth from super-history, is both increasingly meaningful and creative. What justifies our faith in history is super-history. Niebuhr hopes to achieve a standpoint which is not engulfed within the particular cultural situation with its particular bias, prejudice, and passion. Eternity is the device for thus extricating his philosophy from the cultural flux. We have inferred that he

probably views this realm of eternity in the manner of Absolute Idealism as a cosmic mind which holds all the past and all the future in a 'total simultaneity.'

Recourse to a cosmic mind cannot be had in a naturalistic interpretation of history. We cannot investigate or operate experimentally with the cosmic whole or with any cosmic consciousness; the concept transcends experience both in particular and in general; we renounce an attempt to bring into discussion what can not, in the nature of the case, be open to investigation. It is dubious if the universe is one harmonious whole or if there is a cosmic consciousness which holds all in a simultaneous present. And it is another problem as to whether this cosmic mind would make any difference to the individual human being. The analogy between this cosmic mind and the mind which we experience is not striking, to say the least.

Another privilege which we renounce is that of having recourse to an esoteric brand of knowledge not open to all human minds. All knowledge, for naturalism, is of events temporally and spatially related. Revelation as a form of knowledge is rejected. We know God only by the growth of meaning which we experience.

Thus we see two particularly fundamental points of variance between the Niebuhr interpretation and one open to naturalism. We confine all that is, all causal efficacy, to time and space and further affirm that all such efficacy is in the form of structured energy in motion. A non-temporal, non-spatial, non-material activity which Niebuhr interprets super-history to be is rejected. And our method of investigating this causal efficacy is confined to the public observance of relationship between events.

With these prefacing remarks we shall turn to our naturalistic interpretation of the empirical data which we found in Niebuhr.

A Correlate to Niebuhr's Super-history. It is a matter open to public investigation that whatever have been the individual fates of nations and cultural epochs, there has been a continuing, though spasmodic and faltering, development of meaning, a progressive growth of mind, a widening of mental horizons in a more appreciable world. Whatever has been the fate of

early empires, out of every period of threatened annihilation there has issued an ever-increasing community of minds; the world has become progressively more appreciable to a wider and growing community of persons. The narrow interests of tribal groups, with the accompanying rigidity of life within the demands of traditional behavior, have gradually enlarged to the community of minds which we know today; there are few places on the globe which do not participate widely in the rest of human living. Interests of all peoples are rapidly coming to interpenetrate. Although there have been epochs of decline in this respect, some with disastrous results, the larger scope of historical events shows a direction toward a larger and larger community of minds and interpenetration of interests.

It is the conviction of naturalism, as we understand it here, that there is a particular structure of events running the entire course of this human history which carries the growth of meaning forward into this widening interpenetration of interests to create a more appreciable world and minds more sensitive to it. The creation of this sensitive community of minds in a wider, more appreciable world is the work of that activity which we call God. Far from being the invasion of the temporal from super-history, this structure of activity is an observable reality operating upon all of us and in all of us in the direction just mentioned. It operates in a creative rôle, bringing man new perspectives, creating the consequent enlarged mind, causing the world to become more determinate, and conveying this enlarged participation of interests into a wider community of minds. Wherever we are able to point to this process at work in history, we have what we may describe as a correlate to Niebuhr's super-history.

It is a striking analogy that we find in the work of this structure of creative interaction and growth of mind the same sort of transcending effects to which Niebuhr has pointed as data proving the presence of super-history. It can be said that man is becoming increasingly transcendent over the causal nexus of natural phenomena, that the racial history of man has been a gradual increase in this transcendence over the moment. The 'pull of the transcendent' is seen in a new light.

Perhaps the most striking mode of activity in which this transcendence has been achieved is through the means of linguistic signs. Increasingly man is able to participate in the interests of others because he is able to share the means of communicating these interests. Of course this structure of creativity which we correlate with Niebuhr's super-history is far more than language; language is but one of the means by which it accomplishes the wider growth of mind. Attentive behavior, appreciative observance, and expressive activity all are involved on the human side. One can readily see how crucial all of these have been in enabling man, as Niebuhr says, to look behind and before, to hold in the present a little of the past with a little of the future, to achieve a freedom from natural phenomena which confine the rest of the animal kingdom. We might say that man, insofar as he participates in this structure of widening horizons, insofar as he is able to include himself within the circle of this enlarged community of minds, is thereby able to participate in a wider range of the appreciable world and to transcend the demands of the present moment accordingly.

With the appearance of the events which marked the beginning of the Christian era, we note increasingly the possibilities for the growth of mind in a larger and more determinate world. For with these epoch-making and revolutionary events there has been made historically continuous a manner of life whereby God and man are able to get together in such a way that God can create the greater good in the life of man without destroying the meaning and worth of the individual men through whom he works. With the advent of Christianity, there appeared in the world a way of living which so transforms those who participate in it that they hold all goals and ambitions subject to the working of this creativity which we call God. With this manner of living, man learns to go through experiences of destruction and suffering, learns to give up what other men would die fighting for, learns to hold all he is or has or ever hopes to be subject to the working of this creativity or growth of mind which he can actually observe at work about him. Man becomes committed to this source of all good and orients his life about it; he finds that he can undergo experiences

of great havoc and remain alert to new values present in even the most revolutionizing change. In such ways, and in unmentioned others, man learns to live the crucified life; he unifies his personality into a readiness to undergo whatever transformation may be involved in the organization of either his own person or of society about him, in order to assimilate perspectives and participate in the larger community which is being created. This is the way of the crucified life. It has increased the possibility of God and man working together without the destroying effects upon human personality. It is a way of life which can be experimentally shown to accomplish all that we claim for it; as it can likewise be demonstrated that it entered history out of the interrelated events which shook the old world at the beginning of the present era.

Where Niebuhr points to the revelation of God which was in Christ and in the Cross 'which towers over time' and testifies to the direct and cataclysmic action of the hand of eternity upon history, we point to the working of this historically continuous manner of life which issued out of the early Christian environment. Where Niebuhr speaks of a new knowledge which is revealed in this revelation of Christ, we disaffirm any new knowledge derived from a non-temporal, non-spatial order, and we point to a structure of interrelated events which we call creativity at work in the world. We are able to demonstrate experimentally that this way of life which we term the 'crucified life' entered history at that point mentioned and enabled God and man to work together in the way we have described. In this we find the significance of the Cross.

We are able to find a mass of evidence in Niebuhr which lends itself to this naturalistic interpretation of history.

> The preservation of cultures and civilizations is frequently possible only as individuals disregard their own success and failure and refuse to inquire too scrupulously into the possibilities or probabilities of maintaining their own life in a given course of action. Thus effective collective historical action depends to a considerable degree upon the individual's contempt for, or indifference to, his own fate; an indifference which is possible only if the individual possesses an implicit or explicit faith in a dimension of existence which is deeper and higher than physical life.[45]

[45] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 89.

This is precisely the situation as regards the relationship between man and that structure of creativity which we have just surveyed. But the orientation of the man is toward a different reality, for whereas Niebuhr is referring to the relevance of sacrificial love in a way which has no critical object deserving of such love, we have suggested that man is able to hold his goals, ambitions, all that he has, subject to that reality which is observed at work creating the growth of meaning in a more appreciable world.

In other instances the phraseology of Niebuhr is relevant to our own interpretation of history.

> All things in history move towards both fulfillment and dissolution, towards the fuller embodiment of their essential character and towards death.[46]

Is this not precisely the case with this on-going process of creativity which destroys the old and from the ashes brings the new into being? The lesser good is ever being destroyed to make way for the greater good — this is the condition of creation.

> Though one age may have to reclaim what previous ages have known and forgotten, history obviously moves towards more inclusive ends, towards more complex human relations, towards the technical enhancement of human powers and the cumulation of knowledge. . . . But . . . the spiritual hatred and the lethal effectiveness of 'civilized' conflicts, compared with tribal warfare or battles in the animal world, are one of many examples of the new evil which arises on a new level of maturity.[47]

Niebuhr employs such statements to affirm his pessimism at man's ability to extricate himself from the tragic possibilities of culture. We agree that man cannot extricate himself; but we point to the growing community of minds which Niebuhr describes; we point to this enlarged sharing of experience and find in this situation undeveloped possibilities for man's emerging some day from this new ferocity which cannot now be gainsaid, emerging to participation in the community of minds which God has fashioned. The world has grown smaller and with this wider reach of individual and group into the experiences of other peoples there follows new power over the lives

[46] Ibid., p. 287.

[47] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 315.

of others; but that wars should result from this condition is not an irrevocable condition nor cause to forego our trust in this process (of creativity) which is working through us creating the larger interpenetration of minds. For interests are yet alien and isolated; perhaps they will always be so; but were men to surrender themselves to the working of this creativity, were men to orient their lives toward this activity which we have surveyed at work in history, wars should cease and ferocity be put under control.

If we turn our attention from the larger scope of history to the individual lives of men who place themselves under the control of this structure of creative interaction, we find phenomena similar to that which Niebuhr describes under the concept 'grace.' In somewhat the manner we have noted in that author, we, too, find that our hypothesis of history is self-justifying in the sense that one who puts himself under its control experiences a new electrifying influx of power as if from outside himself.

> The Christian experience of the new life is an experience of a new selfhood. The new self is more truly a real self because the vicious circle of self-centredness has been broken. The self lives in and for others, in the general orientation of loyalty to, and love of, God; who alone can do justice to the freedom of the self over all partial interests and values. This new self is the real self; for the self is infinitely self-transcendent; and any premature centring of itself around its own interests, individually or collectively, destroys and corrupts its freedom.[48]

To this we agree whole-heartedly; and we pause to point out the confusion in Niebuhr's mind with regard to the possibilities of man's development. Rarely does he reveal a hope that man might be 'infinitely self-transcendent' as he affirms here. But we agree with what he says and call attention to the remarkable manner in which this passage lends itself to that giving of one's self into the control of creativity which we have been discussing.

Conclusion. In some such brief manner would a naturalist interpret the empirical data which Niebuhr employs to bolster belief in eternity. Whereas our author finds the dimensions of

[48] Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 110.

life and the progressive development of historical meanings resolved in a non-spatial, non-temporal realm of eternity or super-history, we find the solution in our treatment of the creativity which releases man from limited perspectives and enables him to participate in a developing structure of meanings which go forward in a cumulative fashion to enlarge the scope of man's experience and to provide a reliable basis for communication of interests.

GHEVOND'S TEXT OF THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN 'UMAR II AND LEO III

ARTHUR JEFFERY
Columbia University

There is a persistent tradition in the Eastern Christian Churches, often referred to by Oriental Christians even at the present day, to the effect that early in the VIIIth century there was an exchange of letters on the question of the respective merits of Christianity and Islam, between the Umayyad Caliph 'Umar II (717–720) and the Byzantine Emperor Leo III, the Isaurian (717–741), in which the Emperor gloriously refuted the claims of Islam. If this is so, it will represent one of the earliest documents in the Muslim-Christian Controversy known to us. Carl Güterbock rightly states that the beginnings of literary discussions concerning Islam among the Greeks can be traced back to the middle of the VIIIth century, when Leo III was succeeded by his son Constantine V (741–775),[1] but he begins his account of the Byzantine polemists with John of Damascus (†754) and his pupil Theodore Abū Qurra (c. 825). A polemical epistle of Leo III to 'Umar must have been written before 720, and would thus be earlier than any known Byzantine tractate on this controversy.

We have notices of this correspondence in various sources. The Byzantine Chronographer Theophanes (†818), writing of the second year of the Caliphate of 'Umar,[2] the year when there was a great earthquake in Syria, and when 'Umar was making great efforts to have the Christians of his realm accept Islam,[3]

[1] Der Islam im Lichte der byzantinischen Polemik, Berlin, 1912, pp. 7, 8.

[2] Chronographia, ed. de Boor, 1883, I, 399.

[3] Eastern Christian writers often speak of 'Umar's severity with the Christians. Michael Syrus XI, 19 (pp. 455, 456 of the text) tells at length how 'Umar legislated to ease the position of those who were willing to become Muslims, and to increase the disabilities of those who were unwilling to accept Islam. See also Barhebraeus' Makhtĕbhānūth Zabhnē, p. 117 (ed. Bedjan, Paris, 1880). But note Wellhausen's rejoinder in Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz, pp. 187 ff.

says — "he also sent a theological epistle to the Emperor Leo, thinking that he might persuade him also to accept Islam," a statement which is repeated in much the same words by Cedrenus (c. 1100) in his Historiarum Compendium. The Syrian writer Maḥbūb, Bishop of Manbij (Hierapolis), better known under his Westernized name Agapius, writing in the middle of the Xth century his Arabic World History, the Kitāb al-'Unwān, not only knows of 'Umar's letter attacking the Christian religion and calling on Leo to become a Muslim, but knows also that the Emperor replied to it, refuting the Caliph's arguments, proving to him the perversity of his own Muslim beliefs, and demonstrating the truth of Christianity from the Scriptures, the laws of reason, and the testimony of the Qur'ān itself.[4] Further, in Armenian literature, besides the account of Ghevond, with which we shall be concerned presently, and in which we are presented not only with a précis of the letter of the Caliph, but also with what purports to be the complete text of Leo's reply, we have references to the correspondence in three later writers. Thoma Ardzruni (c. 936) in his History,[5] and Kirakos of Gandzac (†1272) in his History of Armenia,[6] both tell us that Leo's reply was so full of sagacity as to put to shame the Caliph, so that he set about reforming many abuses among the Muslim people, and from that time on showed a much more benevolent spirit towards the Christians of his realm. Finally, Vartan (†1272) in his Universal History,[7] mentions 'Umar's enquiry as to the seventy-two sects of the Christians, and quotes Leo's reply thereto. All three, however, may be dependent on Ghevond, whose account, in any case, is the earliest and the fullest.

There is no a priori ground for rejecting the possibility of such an exchange of letters between the two potentates. No one familiar with the Arabic accounts of 'Umar's reign would find anything strange in the story of such a letter to the Byzantine

[4] Kitāb al-'Unwān, ed. A. Vasiliev in Patr. Orient. VIII, 3 (Paris, 1912), p. 503.

[5] Patmoui Arcroumeaç 'i 5 girs ṣamn 996 (History of the Ardzrunids to 996 in 5 Books), ed. Constantinople, 1852, p. 116; ed. St. Petersburg, 1887, p. 105.

[6] Patmoutiun iuroy žamanakim vasn aršauanaç Tataraç (History of his own Times and the Invasion of the Tatars), ed. Venice, 1865, p. 37.

[7] Text in Muyldermans, La Domination arabe en Arménie, Paris, 1927, pp. 52, 53.

Emperor. 'Umar's zeal for the propagation of Islam was as noteworthy as that of Leo for propagating a pure and undefiled Christianity. The Muslim accounts of this Caliph's reign abound in eulogies of his piety and his interest in religion, which he was eager to spread even at the expense of the Treasury. His instructions to his Governors in Khurāsān to ease the conditions as to tribute, a move which led to the people of that area flocking into Islam, are famous,[8] and he apparently tried the same move in Spain, and when it failed sought to reduce the influence of the Spanish Christians by dividing up their lands. But even more famous is his retort to an official who objected that these numerous conversions, by reducing the numbers of the non-Muslim body which supplied the tribute, were adversely affecting the Treasury, that Allah had sent His Prophet as a Missionary not as a Tax-collector. That he was given to writing epistles in the interests of his propaganda for Islam, is also clear. We find accounts of how he wrote to the Princes of Transoxiana, inviting them to accept Islam; of how he addressed a rescript to the Kings of Sindh, to whom he promised all the privileges and immunities of Arabs if only they would become Muslims; and of how he had great success with the letters he wrote to urge the Berbers of North Africa to accept Islam.

That he was actually in correspondence with the Byzantine Empire is likewise evident, though this correspondence was in another connection. In the Kitāb al-Aghānī we have the text of a letter he sent to the Muslim prisoners at Qusṭanṭinīyya, who had been taken in the wars with the Byzantines, consoling them in their affliction, and assuring them of his care for their families at home, while Balādhurī, in his account of Latikieh, which was attacked and destroyed by a Byzantine raid about 718 (= 100 A.H.), tells how 'Umar sent to the Greek Emperor (*Ṭāghiyah*) asking to be allowed to ransom the Muslim captives taken there. This was not religious correspondence, but all that we learn from Muslim sources about 'Umar favors the possibility of such a correspondence.

[8] Ṭabarī, Annales, II, 1354; Ibn al-Athīr Kāmil, ed. Tornberg, V, 37.

Nor is it difficult to believe that Leo should write, or have written in his name, a reply to such a letter from the Caliph. His interest in the promotion of the Christian religion is one of the outstanding features of his reign. His activities in connection with the iconoclastic controversy need not be more than mentioned, but he was also active in promoting the baptism of Jews and Montanists, and not always, perhaps, by the most reputable methods. That he too indulged in lengthy correspondence on points of theological disputation, is clear from his correspondence with Pope Gregory II in Rome, in one of which letters, indeed, he claims to be priest as well as Emperor.

Leo's relations with Muslim peoples had begun long before his elevation to the imperial throne. The Germanicia of his childhood days is the Arabic Mar'ash, in the far north of Syria at the border of Asia Minor, and this Mar'ash was taken as early as 637 by Khālid b. al-Walīd, who destroyed it. Then it was used as a base of operations against the Byzantine Empire, and was built up by the first Umayyad Caliph, Mu'āwiya (661–680), who settled it with troops. Under Yazīd, the son and successor of Mu'āwiya, the Greeks succeeded in driving the Muslims out of it entirely, and from then on it was the scene of almost constant battles between Muslims and Greeks, and was so badly damaged in the fighting that about 694 al-'Abbās, a grandson of 'Abd al-Malik, had to rebuild and fortify it, moving into it a great body of troops and building a notable mosque in it. In the days of Leo's youth it probably contained more Muslims than it did Greeks, so that he must have been in constant contact with Muslims at Mar'ash, while most of his active life as a soldier, whether as Spatharius on the Lazian frontier, or as military commander of the Anatolic Theme under Anastasius II, was spent in combating Muslim armies, long before his brilliant relief of Amorium in 716, his relief of Constantinople from the Muslim fleet in 717, and his final defeat of Maslama's armies in the winter of 717–718, gave him the name of champion of Christianity against the Muslims. It would not even be surprising if Leo knew of Islam from direct acquaintance with Arabic sources, as he claims in the text of his letter

in Ghevond, for though he is still called "the Isaurian," following our Greek text of Theophanes, there is a good case for regarding him as a Syrian,[9] and one Arabic source informs us that as a Christian citizen of Mar'ash he could speak fluently and correctly both Greek and Arabic.[10] The Leo who so obviously enjoyed his controversy with Pope Gregory and with John of Damascus, we may well imagine would enjoy equally well a similar controversy with 'Umar, the Caliph of the Muslims.

But though the possibility of such an exchange of controversial letters between Leo and 'Umar may be granted, whether it did actually take place is another question. No Muslim source available to us makes any mention of it, and of the Christian sources, the only one which supplies any detailed information about it is the Armenian history of Ghevond, which brings it in incidentally in the midst of an account of the wars between the Arabs and the Armenians.[11] In Migne's Patrologia Graeca, CVII, cols. 315–324, we find the Latin version of an *Epistola Leonis Imperatoris Augusti cognomento Philosophi ad Omarum Saracenorum regem de fidei christianae veritate et mysteriis et de variis Saracenorum haeresibus et blasphemiis*, printed among the works of Leo VI (886–912) the Philosopher. A comparison of this with the text of Ghevond makes it clear that the Latin, though much briefer and some-

[9] The statement of Theophanes, Chronographia, I, 391 τῇ ἀληθείᾳ δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ἰσαυρίας, is probably due to a confusion of Germanikeia in Comagene with Germanikopolis in Charicene, which latter might be called Isauria.

[10] Kitāb al-'Uyūn in de Goeje et de Jong Fragmenta Historicorum Arabicorum, I, 25. This writer informs us that when Leo was appointed Patricius of Amorium, the citizens of that place objected to his appointment on the ground that he was a Nabataean Arab.

[11] Hildebrand Beck in a monograph "Vorsehung und Vorherbestimmung in der theologischen Literatur der Byzantiner" in Orientalia Christiana Analecta, CXIV (Rome, 1937), to which the Editors of the H. T. R. have called my attention, devotes a paragraph to "Pseudo-Leon III" (pp. 43–46) in his section on "Die Polemiker gegen den Islam," and considers that the correspondence between Leo and 'Umar is not part of the original history of Ghevond, but was inserted therein by some later hand at the end of the IXth or the beginning of the Xth century. Obviously this correspondence does break the sequence of the history and reads like an insertion, but it would have been such even if placed there by Ghevond himself, and Beck's arguments against its being part of the original text of Ghevond are only valid if Ghevond, as he assumes, wrote in the VIIIth century; but this, as we shall presently see, is an assumption which cannot be justified.

what differently arranged, is really the same material, meeting the same Muslim objections with essentially the same arguments. As there was no Saracen ruler 'Umar contemporary with Leo VI to whom that Emperor could have addressed such an Epistle, the probability is that this is really a Latin summary of the letter elsewhere ascribed to Leo III, and wrongly attributed to his more theologically minded namesake.[12]

But if the Latin form is an abbreviated and somewhat corrupted text, the Armenian form in Ghevond, as we have it,[13] errs in the other direction, for it occasionally expands the argument with references to Islamic matters that can hardly be dated as early as the reigns of 'Umar and Leo III. A comparison of the two texts shows that it is not possible to regard the Latin as an abbreviation of the Armenian, nor to look on the Armenian as an expansion and amplification of the Latin, so that we are forced to assume a Greek document [14] purporting

[12] Ehrhard in Krumbacher's Geschichte der byzantinische Literatur[2] (1897), p. 168, and the Abbé Vogt in Camb. Med. Hist. IV, 59, accept without question the attribution of the letter to Leo VI, following its earlier acceptance as such by Baronius, Fabricius and Migne, and Wolfgang Eichner in Der Islam XXIII (1936), p. 142, by setting a date c. 900 for it, is obviously following the same opinion. Dom Ceillier had, however, seen that it must have been wrongly assigned to Leo VI, and Popov in his special study of the work of this Emperor, Императоръ Левъ Мудрый и его царствованіе въ церковно-историческомъ отношеніи, Moscow, 1892, shows that not only is the letter quite unworthy of his subtle pen, but in its Latin form it expressly supports the Roman Catholic side of the *Filioque* controversy, whereas in the genuine works of Leo VI he expresses himself definitely on the other side.

[13] My translation of the letters was made years ago from Chahnazarian's text, but in preparing this article I have only been able to use the text in the edition of St. Petersburg, 1887, edited by K. Iziants, a microfilm of which was put at my disposal by the kindness and courtesy of Professor R. Blake and the Librarian of Harvard University. Chahnazarian's edition was printed at Paris in 1857, and it was from this text that the Russian translation by Patkanian was made. Fortunately the 1887 edition includes the critical notes of both Chahnazarian and Patkanian.

[14] K. Schenk, however, in his article in Byzantinische Zeitschrift, V, 1896, p. 277 n. 2, considers the whole letter an invention, — "Was endlich den Bekehrungsbrief anlangt, so ist dieser wohl in das Reich der Fabel zu verweisen, da es Omar nicht einfallen konnte zu erwarten, dass der Kaiser, siegesfroh und stolz, Byzanz errettet zu haben, noch in demselben Jahre zum Glauben der geschlagenen Feinde übertreten werde. Die Erzählung wird erfunden sein zu dem Behufe, die Behauptung, Leon sei ein Freund des Islam, zu rechtfertigen." This is perhaps being hypercritical, for the sending of such a letter is not at all out of character with the 'Umar who meets us in the Muslim sources. Brosset has a note on the correspondence in his Deux historiens arméniens (St. Peters-

to give some account of the letter of 'Umar to Leo, and the text of Leo's reply, which in a considerably reduced form survived in a Latin translation in the West, and in a somewhat expanded form was preserved in an Armenian translation in the East. It may be noted that the Armenian translation, whether we accept an earlier or a later date for Ghevond, rules out the attribution of the letter to Leo VI.

The date of Ghevond (Leontius) is somewhat difficult to determine. Armenian writers generally include him among the historians of the VIIIth century, but Neumann in his Versuch einer Geschichte der armenischen Literatur (Leipzig, 1836), p. 129, lists him among the writers of the Xth century, and this latter date, one must admit, would suit better the information he has about Islam. He is definitely quoted by Mekhitar of Airivank in the XIIth century, and is referred to by Stephen Asoghik, a Xth century writer, so that his work must be earlier than either of them. Chahnazarian, who first edited the text of Ghevond (Paris, 1854), makes a defense of the VIIIth Century date by pointing to the facts (1) that his chronicle of the relations between Arabs and Armenians runs from 632 to 788, and one would imagine that he had brought it up to his own time; (2) that in telling of the battle of Arjīsh [15] between the Arabs and Armenians in 770–771, he speaks as though his account were drawn from eyewitnesses of that battle, for he says "the enemies themselves have assured me of the fact, saying," and again, "they have also told me." In the colophon of the St. Petersburg text we read that Ghevond's account was made at the command of the Lord Shapuh Bagratuni. If this Shapuh is the brother of Ashot Msaker, as Chahnazarian and Petermann assume, then as he died in 824,[16] Ghevond must have flourished in the VIIIth century.[17] But there was another

burg, 1870), p. 34. H. Beck in Orientalia Christiana Analecta, CXIV, p. 44 n., adduces a number of little pieces of evidence to show that there was a Greek text underlying the Armenian; e.g. he refers to "our Greek language," calls the Torah *νόμος*, uses the LXX names for Chronicles and Canticles, etc.

[15] Balādhurī Futūḥ, 200.

[16] See Tableau II B, "Les Bagratounis," in Muyldermans, La Domination arabe en Arménie, p. 148.

[17] Finck in the section on Armenian Literature in "Die orientalischen Literaturer,"

Shapuh among the Bagratids, a son of Sembat the Confessor (†855), and brother of that other Ashot (†890) who was king of Armenia, so that if Ghevond's account was written for him it would give us a date in the latter half of the IXth or even the beginning of the Xth century, which would suit much better some of the Islamic references in the text, e.g. its mention on p. 61, among the Muslim sects, of the Jāḥiẓīyya, a sect which only developed after the death of al-Jāḥiẓ in 869, and so could hardly have been known to a writer in the VIIIth century.[18]

In the St. Petersburg edition of 1887, the letter of 'Umar and the reply of Leo are given in Chapters XIII and XIV of Ghevond's History, pp. 43–99.

Die Kultur der Gegenwart, I, vii (1906), p. 289, accepts a date at the end of the VIIIth century, but H. Beck in Byzant. Zeitschr. XXXVII (1937), p. 436, who places the Greek original of the letter "aus der Wende des X Jahrh.," obviously accepts the later date for Ghevond. Ernst Filler's Thesis Quaestiones de Leontii Armenii Historia, Leipzig, 1903, also supports an VIIIth century date, following Chahnazarian in making a special point that Stephen of Asoghik, in his list of historians, places Ghevond between Sebeos and the two Xth century writers Shapuh and Johannes Catholicos, while Kirakos places him between Sebeos and Thoma Ardzruni. This, however, would not obviate a date late in the IXth or early in the Xth century, and as a matter of fact Mekhitar of Airavank, in his Tabula of the Armenian historians, places him between Moses Arghovan and Oukhtanes, both Xth century writers (Brosset, Histoire chronologique par Mkhitar d'Airavank, St. Petersburg, 1869, p. 25, in Tome XIII No. 5 of the Mémoires de l'Académie impériale des Sciences de Saint-Petersbourg, VIIe série). Filler raises objections to the general accuracy of Mekhitar, but it may be pointed out that his date agrees better with the fact that Ghevond on p. 61 of the text speaks of its "being now 800 years since Christ appeared," though Brosset in a note on p. 80 of his Mkhitar refers to Ghevond as "presque contemporain" with the events of Leo III's reign. J. H. Petermann in his essay De Ostikanis, Arabicis Armeniae gubernatoribus, Berlin, 1840, p. 9 had made Ghevond a contemporary of Thoma Ardzruni in the Xth century, and E. W. Brooks, "Byzantines and Arabs in the Time of the Early Abbasids," in the English Historical Review, XV (Oct., 1900), p. 731, judges that "the Armenian Leontius, though his history only comes down to 790, seems to have written in the latter half of the ninth century," with which dating we agree.

[18] There have been two translations of the History of Ghevond, one by Chahnazarian, Paris, 1856, Histoire des Guerres et des Conquêtes des Arabes en Arménie, par l'éminent Ghévond, vardabed arménien, écrivain du huitième siècle, traduite par Garabed V. Chahnazarian, and one by K. Patkanian, St. Petersburg, 1862 — Исторія халифовъ Вардапета Гевонда. писателя VIII вѣка. Переводъ съ армянскаго. Both these, however, are so rare as to be unprocurable.

The Letter of 'Umar to Leo

'Umar, in the name of Allah, Caliph of the Muslims, to Leo Emperor of Byzantium

There has often come over me a desire to know the teachings of your so imaginative religion, and to make a profound study of your beliefs, but I have not hitherto been able to realize my intentions in this regard. So I pray you, tell me truly, why was it that Jesus and His disciples came naked into this world, and returned the same? Why is it that you have not been willing to accept what Jesus Himself has said as to His person, but have preferred to make researches into the books of the Prophets and the Psalms, in order to find there testimonies to prove the incarnation of Jesus? This provides a reason for suspecting that you had doubts, and regarded as insufficient the testimony that Jesus bears to Himself, since you give credence only to what the Prophets have said, whereas in truth, Jesus Himself is the more worthy of credence, since He was near to God, and knew His person better than mere men, whose writings, in any case, have been falsified by people unknown to you. How, indeed, are you able to justify these same Scriptures, and follow them in what suits your intentions? You declare that the Code was more than once written by the Children of Israel who read it and understood it, and that it was many times lost, so that for a long time there was nothing of it remaining among them, till at a later period some men recomposed it out of their own heads. You admit that it was handed down from generation to generation, from people to people, by fleshly creatures, who inasmuch as they were sons of Adam, were forgetful, subject to error, and perhaps acting under the inspiration of Satan, and those who, by their hostile acts, resemble him. Why is it, that in the Mosaic Code one finds no clear indication of either heaven or hell, or of the resurrection or judgment? It is the evangelists Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, who have spoken of these matters according to their talent. Is it not true that Jesus, speaking in the Gospel about the coming Paraclete, pointed to the mission of our Muḥammad? Why have the Christian peoples, since the death of the disciples of Jesus, split

up into seventy-two races? Why have they made Jesus the associate and the equal of the unique and all-powerful God? Why do they profess three gods, and arbitrarily change all the laws, such as that of circumcision into baptism, that of sacrifice into the eucharist, that of Saturday into Sunday? Is it possible that God could have dwelt in flesh and blood, and in the unclean entrails of a woman? Why do you adore the bones of Apostles and Prophets, and also pictures and the cross, which anciently served, according to the law, as an instrument of torture? The Prophet Isaiah gives testimony to our lawgiver, as being the equal and the like of Jesus, when he speaks in his vision, of two riders, mounted, the one on an ass and the other on a camel, so why do you not believe in that? Send me explications on these points, all of them, so that I may know your religious opinions.

Such were the questions, says Ghevond, which, with many others besides, 'Umar, sovereign of the Arabs, addressed to the Emperor Leo, who, in his turn, felt himself obliged to reply.

The Caliph's questions are almost all *loci communes* of the Muḥammadan Controversy, though it is a little surprising to see some of them developed so early as 'Umar II. To the reader unfamiliar with this special branch of Arabic literature, however, some points need a little explanation.

Jesus and His disciples coming and going naked. The reference is to the voluntary poverty of Jesus and the disciples, who were people of no worldly account when they commenced their mission, and had no worldly possessions when their ministry closed. Leo has quite mistaken the reference in his answer to this. Even to the present day the popularly read lives of Muḥammad are at pains to demonstrate that, on the contrary, the Arabian Prophet was of the noblest family and proudest lineage of the Arabs, and his Companions among the best-born and most influentially connected at Mecca. Moreover, Muḥammad promised his followers that they should inherit the rich possessions of the people surrounding them, as a reward for their acceptance of Islam. The writers of the Eastern Church frequently remark on this. For example, the Armenian historian Sebeos,[19] in his

[19] Edition of 1851, p. 164, 165.

account of Muḥammad, tells of how the Prophet urged on his followers that they as Muslims were the true Children of Abraham, and so should go up and possess his inheritance. Ghevond has much the same story at the beginning of his history, and Michael Syrus [20] tells how the Prophet encouraged his armies with the promise that if they were faithful to Allah, He would give them a fine country as an inheritance.

Researches into the books of the Prophets and the Psalms. A glance at the arrangement of the material in the early part of the Epistola Leonis ad Omarum Saracenorum, in PG, CVII, will show what he means. The early Apologists, for example Justin Martyr in his apology for the Christians to Antoninus Pius, had set the example of assembling a great body of verses and fragments of verses from the Old Testament, and particularly from the Prophets and Psalms, which they judged to be clear cases of the foretelling of the coming life and work of the Christ, and apparently the earliest controversies with Islam brought out the same style of argument. This was probably true in the lifetime of the Prophet himself, for he would hardly have been so eager to see in the earlier Scriptures prophetic references to his own coming (cf. VII, 156 and LXI, 6), had he not heard the Christians of his day urging the Old Testament prophecies as grounds for their claims in their preaching of Jesus.

What the Caliph is thinking of in his objection to this, is firstly, that in the Qur'ān Jesus bears witness to Himself while still an infant in the cradle (XIX, 30–35), and secondly, that His witness is more worthy of acceptance than that of any Prophet or Psalmist, since in the Qur'ān He is one "of those who draw near" (III, 40 *min almuqarrabīn*), a phrase used elsewhere of the Angels of the Presence (IV, 170), and of certain groups of the blessed in Paradise (LVI, 11, 87; LXXXIII, 21, 28), so that to seek witness from others rather than accepting the witness He bears to Himself savors of disbelief in Him.

Falsification of the Scriptures. Most Muslim works of polemic deal at length with this question of the corruption of the Jewish Scriptures, a question that is as old as the Clementine literature and the Manichaean controversy. In Muslim polemic it is the matter technically known as the question of *taḥrīf*. This

[20] Ed. Chabot, p. 405 of the Syriac text.

word is the verbal noun from Stem II, *ḥarrafa* — "to change the letters" (*ḥarf*, pl. *ḥurūf*), and the charge of *taḥrīf* is ultimately based on a passage in the Qur'ān (II, 70, cf. IV, 48; V, 16, 45), where the Jews are accused of altering Scripture. What Muḥammad refers to in this passage seems obviously to be the naughty habit of some of the Madīnan Jews, who, when he asked them about their Torah, would listen to it read in Hebrew, and then garble it when they translated it to him, in order to make mock of him. In the polemical writers, however, it is more generally taken to mean that the Scriptures in the hands of the Jews have been deliberately altered by designing men,[21] so that what the Jews (and Christians) now use as Scripture, are not the original texts as revealed by God. Ibn Ḥazm of Cordova (†1064), Ṣāliḥ al-Ja'farī (c. 1200) and al-Qarāfī aṣ-Ṣanhājī (†1285) all deal at length with this question, it was raised by al-Mahdī with the Patriarch Timothy,[22] and it was one of the questions that had to be met by al-Kindī.[23]

How much a part of the general Muslim outlook this doctrine of *taḥrīf* had become is well illustrated by the way the Jewish convert 'Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī, who must surely have known better, feels obliged, in his denunciation of his former co-religionists, to charge that the Scriptures in their hands are only poor falsifications.[24] The reference to its having been recomposed we shall take up later.

Follow them in what suits your intentions. From the earliest period of the Muslim-Christian controversy this charge is made on both sides. The Caliph here makes it against the Christians,

[21] Some Muslim writers commonly understand *taḥrīf* as meaning "false exegesis" of the Biblical passages, but the favorite meaning with the polemical writers, since Ibn Ḥazm's day, has been to take it as meaning deliberate tampering with the text. Ignazio di Matteo has a long discussion of this matter, "Il *Taḥrīf* od alterazione della Bibbia secondo i Musulmani" in Bessarione, XXXVIII (1922), 64–111, 223–260, Fritzsch has a section on it, pp. 54–74 of his Islam und Christentum im Mittelalter (Breslau, 1930), and the word is discussed by Goldziher in ZDMG, XXXII (1878), p. 364 ff.

[22] Mingana's text in Woodbrooke Studies, II, p. 55. This disposes of the objection of H. Beck in Orientalia Christiana Analecta CXIV, 44 n., that the Muslim argument concerning the Torah falsification by the Jews was only raised in this form in the IX/Xth centuries.

[23] Risāla, ed. of 1880, pp. 138–140.

[24] M. Perlmann in JQR, XXXI (1940), pp. 177, 181.

and we shall see in Leo's letter how he retorts on more than one occasion that the Muslims select passages, both of the Old and the New Testaments, which suit their argument or seem to support their cause, while rejecting what may be used against them. The same charges were made in the Manichaean controversy, where we find Faustus, for example, complaining that Augustine only takes what suits him from the Old Testament and explains away what does not suit his intentions, while Augustine has the same complaint to make against Faustus and his friends.

No clear indications of eschatology. The Muslim finds so much detail in regard to eschatological matters in the Qur'ān and the Traditions, that it naturally struck him as very strange that he found so little descriptive matter in the Old Testament regarding the pains of hell, the pleasures of heaven, or details on the great day of resurrection and judgment, though there were passages more to his mind in the Gospels. This is not a subject usually raised by the polemic writers, though Perlmann, in his account of the Moroccan Jewish convert to Islam, 'Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Islāmī, mentions that one of the points he makes against the Jewish Scriptures is that they contain no reference to paradise or hell, as they would do if they were of divine origin.[25] Leo makes little attempt to meet this charge, and the Latin in 315b, 321b, refers to the evidence of Esdras, which may mean the matter in II (IV) Esdras vii & viii.[26]

The other points raised by the Caliph will come up for explanation, where necessary, in the notes on the reply of Leo, to which we now turn.

Flavian Leo, Emperor, the Servant of Jesus Christ, and sovereign of those who know Him, to 'Umar, Chief of the Saracens.

What exact reply can I make to all the arguments you advance against me? It is God Himself who commands us to in-

[25] JQR, XXXI, 187.

[26] On the other hand, his Esdras may not refer to the book in the Apocrypha, but merely to Ezra as the restorer of the Old Testament.

struct our adversaries with kindliness, to see whether He will not grant them time to repent. Moreover, our ordinary laws by no means impose on us the duty of smiting with hard words, as with stones, those who manifest a desire to learn the marvellous mystery of the truth. But as your letter, in its opening, did not reveal even the least appearance of truthfulness, it is laid on us that we call not just that which is not. In your letter you say that we have discussed with you more than once the divine mysteries of our Christian religion, but that you have not succeeded in being able to study its doctrines, which you refer to as imaginary. These two statements, however, are not accurate. As a matter of fact, nothing would induce us to discuss with you our doctrines, since our Lord and Master Himself has bidden us refrain from exposing our unique and divine doctrine before heretics, for fear it be turned into ridicule, and least of all before those to whom the predictions of the Prophets and the testimony of the Apostles are as something strange. This is the rule we observe towards others. It is true that we have several times written to you, and shall write to you again does necessity demand, but it has always been about mundane affairs,[27] never about affairs divine. Still, Holy Writ bids us reply to those who question us[28] and maintain silence before those who do not. With regard to you, however, we are not now for the first time learning about the substance of your beliefs, for we have been commanded of God to examine all, and hold fast to that which is good. So we possess historical documents composed by our blessed prelates who were living at the same epoch as your legislator Muḥammad, and these writings[29] make it unnecessary for us to importune you on the subject of your religion. However, that you may not think we are ashamed to profess a religion so marvellous as ours, hearken,

[27] This may be indirect confirmation of the fact that 'Umar wrote to the Emperor about the prisoners taken at Latikieh.

[28] Perhaps he is thinking of I Pet. III, 15.

[29] It is not impossible, of course, that Byzantine prelates, roughly contemporary with Muḥammad, may have written some account of the new religion that had arisen in Arabia, but if they did we know nothing of it. The earliest Christian references to Muḥammad and Islam so far known to us, e.g. those of John of Phenek and Sebeos, are bare historical notices, which tell us very little about the religion itself.

if it please you, and in hearkening to me, you will, as Isaiah says, eat of the good produce of the earth.[30]

It is truly difficult to refute even the most palpable lie, when the adversary dreams only of obstinately persisting in it. Let me explain it to you this way. Suppose two men are standing near a fire. One of them recognizes that this element really is fire, but the other, driven by a spirit of contradiction, says that it is a spring of water, then the bad faith of the latter is evident. Just so you advance that our Lord has said in the Gospel — "We came into this world naked, and we shall quit it in the same state," whereas we do not find in the Gospels any such statement coming from our Lord, though He does counsel us often to meditate upon death. On the contrary it was the just Job, who said, after having been tempted by Satan, "Naked was I born, and so shall I die. The Lord hath given, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord" (Job I, 21). It is thus that you are wont to elude and mutilate the evidence of Holy Scriptures that you have not read, and will not read. You love to make traffic of the things of God and of the faith, by catching hold in the Scriptures of some word which appears favorable to your opinions, and employing it in your defense. Puffed up as you are in your despotism, nevertheless hearken to my replies.

You say that we have found in the Psalms of David and in the books of the Prophets testimonies regarding our Lord, but today is not the first time we have searched for and found such words of the Holy Spirit, who spoke them by the mouths of the Prophets. It is by such words as these, aided by the grace of God, that Christianity has been preached since its origin, has been founded, propagated and believed. It is by these words, I say, that it will still prosper, by the power of God the Creator. You write that we have contented ourselves with these words, and that we have had faith in them, without paying due attention to what Jesus has said about His own person, regarding that as something doubtful and uncertain. It would

[30] Isa. LV, 2. Perhaps a reference to the already mentioned promise of Muḥammad to the Muslims, that if they were obedient to the new faith they would eat of the goodly inheritance.

be a desirable thing for you, following your own words, to have had faith in the infallible and positive statements of the Gospel, rather than in any other. Now, although there exists no contradiction between the Old and the New Testaments, seeing that God, the unique source of mercy, cannot at the same time produce both good and bad, truth and lies, yet God, to make easier to the Jewish people the acceptance of the incarnate Word, placed in the mouths of the Prophets declarations, parables and clear predictions, so that His people should be instructed in advance, and prepared to receive Jesus Christ, and not oppose Him, as it has done. In the very same way, the Saviour, in the Gospel, has borne testimony to His person, and having become incarnate, cited in the most express fashion all the testimonies which the Prophets had given of Him before His incarnation.

I propose, with the aid and by the grace of God, to show you all this,[31] point by point, in my present letter, attributing the most glorious of these predictions to His superhuman nature, and the more humble ones to His human nature.

You write that Jesus merits our confidence because, being near to God, He knew Him better than all those who have written about Him, and whose writings, for the rest, have been falsified by people whom we know not. I reply, that the truth cannot deny what is and at the same time affirm that which is not, whereas the lie is capable of anything, being able to deny not only things visible, but even the Creator Himself, by professing that there is no God. Consequently it is not astonishing that the lie should deny the existence of the Holy Scriptures,

[31] The assembly of Scripture witnesses which follows, as that in the Latin 316–318, is his answer to the Caliph's charge against the Christians of making Jesus the associate and equal of God. The Caliph in this is merely following the Qur'ān, for there (Sūra V, 116, 117) Muḥammad has God take Jesus to task for the claim of the Christians that He and His Mother were Gods beside God, and He denies that He had told His followers any such thing. Also in V, 76 the Qur'ān makes Jesus proclaim that Allah alone is God to be worshipped, for those who associate anything with Allah will find paradise denied them. The use of terms in the Caliph's charge is worth noting — "associate," "equal," "unique," "all-powerful," all of them Qur'ānic terms, so that it would be interesting to know what the Greek terms were. Perhaps the use in the Latin 315a, 317c of the title "Son of Mary," is because this title (*ibn Maryam*), is the most commonly used name for Christ in the Qur'ān itself.

or accuse them of defects. Jesus is, indeed, worthy of confidence; not, however, as mere man and deprived of the Word of God, but as perfect man and perfect God. Just as His commands, set forth by the mouths of the Prophets, merit our entire confidence, not because they were pronounced by men, but because it was the Word of God which dictated them before His incarnation. And as it was that Word itself which inspired them in the Old and in the New Testaments, it is for that reason that no contradiction is found in them. As for what you affirm about the falsification of these writings, if it is the head of your religion who has taught you this, he has forgotten himself,[32] and if it is some other, he only lied the worse.

Hearken, then, and reflect. The head of your religion admits that one must accept nothing without witnesses,[33] and he adds that the (Mosaic) Code held the same, and indeed, the Code does ordain that every testimony be confirmed by two or three witnesses. We know that it was Abraham who earlier received the promise of the mission of Christ, and it was to him that God said — "All nations of the earth shall be blessed in thy seed" (Gen. XXII, 18). Isaac, nourished on the same hope, blessed Jacob, and then he, with the same end in view, blessed Judah, saying — "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a legislator from between his feet, until Shiloh come, to whom will belong the assembly of the peoples" (Gen. XLIX, 10). We know too, that Moses, to the same end, ordained and designated Joshua (Deut. XXXI, 7, 14, 23). Recall also David, Solomon, the twelve prophets, with Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel, Job the just, John Baptist son of Zachariah. Add to these the twelve Apostles, and the

[32] He is referring to the fact that in the Qur'ān Muḥammad himself, on more than one occasion, appealed to the testimony of the Scriptures in the hands of the Jews and Christians.

[33] Sūra V, 105–107, 96; LXV, 2; II, 282; IV, 7, 19 are the classical passages about the calling of witnesses, but in none of them is there any reference to this being also in the Torah of Moses, though the Commentators know of the regulation in Deut. XVII, 6. Leo later brings up again this question of Muḥammad's demanding two witnesses, as a ground for objecting to Muslim rejection of the divinity of Christ on the single witness of Muḥammad himself, whereas the Christians can produce many witnesses in favor of it from the Old and New Testaments.

seventy disciples of the Lord, in all a hundred and eleven persons in the Old and New Testaments. You despise then so many holy persons, cherished of God, who have predicted the coming of Christ, people to whom Muḥammad himself bore this testimony that they were holy servants of God,[34] that Muḥammad may appear more worthy of faith than God speaking through them, and than the Word of God manifest in the flesh. Well, I put to you this question, and I beg you to reply. Is the testimony borne by a hundred and eleven servants of God, speaking unanimously of the same Saviour, more worthy of faith than that of a dissident or heterodox, who while he lies thinks that he is telling the truth? Remember that Muḥammad in speaking of them, represents them as saints, and as the favored ministers of God, and compels you to regard them as such, whereas what God has said through them he himself rejects and prevents others from admitting.

You ask how we can depend on the book of the Jews, the Old Testament, as you maintain that we believe that this book was several times written and lost, until after long years some individuals undertook to recompose it after their own ideas. Thus, according to the opinion that you attribute to us, such work would have continued being done from generation to generation, while those who did it were exposed to all sorts of error and to the seductions of Satan, and those who by their hateful spirit resemble him. In reply, I am much astonished, not only at your incredulity, but also at the manner in which, without a blush, you expose ideas which render you ridiculous, while you pretend to seduce us by our own words.

Thus you commence your letter by citing one of our opinions, pretending to draw from it all that follows, as though that had emanated from us. But if you believe in our opinions you must believe in them altogether, because no one can base himself on a lie, and it is a lie to adopt a part of a testimony and reject the other part. However, as you are not instructed, hearken and learn.

[34] The reference is probably to such passages as XIX, 59 and VI, 84–87, which represent the Prophets as rightly guided, and LXI, 14; V, 111, which refer to the Ḥawāriyyūn, who were the followers of Jesus.

When we say that it was the Hebrews who composed the Old Testament, we do not mean to say that they have produced it out of their imaginations, but that they composed it in the sanctuary, on the faith of authentic documents from holy and pious men of their nation, and drawing from the works of the Prophets themselves. The number of beings created by God during the first six days, amounts to 22,[35] and so the Old Testament contains 22 books received by the Jews as well as by us. Their alphabet is composed of 22 letters, of which five may be doubled, and that not without an important signification. That is by inspiration of God through His Prophets, that all the truths might be attested, the ones by the others. Of these 22 books, five are known under the name of the Law or the Code, and called by the Hebrews *Torah*, by the Syrians *Oratha*, and by us *Nomos*. They contain teaching about the knowledge of God, an account of the creation of the world by Him, the prohibition of the worship of pagan divinities, the covenant concluded with Abraham, the goal of which was Christ, and the laws concerning civil procedure and sacrifice, laws which put them far from the customs of that paganism for which they showed so much attachment. Then the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth; the four of Kings, the Paralipomena, containing the marvellous works of God, wrought from time to time, and the exact genealogy of the just, descending regularly to Christ. They recount also the history of Israel, indicating what kings among them were agreeable to God, and those who were not; of how the Jewish people, because of their sins, were separated into two kingdoms, that of Judah and that of Israel; and finally of their captivity. Then the Psalms of David; the books of Solomon, called by the Jews Koheleth and Shir-ashirim, but by us Parimon and Samatan; [36] those of the twelve Prophets,

[35] This number 22 is no argument against the ascription of the letter to Leo, on the ground that the Emperor, familiar with the Septuagint, would have used the orthodox list containing the Deuterocanonica. It must be remembered that not all Greek lists of the Canon contained the Deuterocanonica, and on the other hand the usual Armenian lists of Ghevond's time would almost certainly have contained the extra books. See Beck's note and references in Orientalia Christiana Analecta, CXIV, 45 n.

[36] The *Kuhiłēi* for Koheleth, and *Širiširim* for Shir hash-Shirim, are fairly good equivalences, but Parimon seems to be a mistake, the subscription παροιμίαι from the

and of Isaiah, of Jeremiah, of Daniel and of Ezekiel, containing all the prophecies as to the coming of Christ. So if anyone among the Jews had wished to falsify herein, the number of books would have had to suffer some change, for the sacrilegious fellows would have had to suppress some, or reduce them to one, two, or at most three books, and retrench the rest, because thus it would have been much easier to get rid of them.

I suppose, too, that you are not ignorant of the enmity which exists between us Christians and the Jews. The sole cause of this is our belief in the divinity of Christ Jesus, whom we regard as the Christ, the Son of God, announced by the Prophets, while the Jews, while admitting the future coming of the Christ, have set themselves against the intimations of the Prophets, and have been unwilling to recognize the Son of God in the person of Christ. So how can one admit that those who might have falsified the books would have left there intact, or would themselves have added, so many indubitable testimonies, which, no matter how much violence is done them, cannot be applied to any other than the incarnate Son of God?

Hear yet my third reponse. The captivity of the Jews took place long before the coming of Christ in the flesh, so how could it be that then, that is to say at the period of Christ, the temple, the testament, the priesthood continued to exist, as the Gospel affirms, according to which the Lord Himself submitted to circumcision and the other ceremonies, precisely as you yourself confirm, and all that without doubt, with the object of proving that it was He Himself who had, by the mouths of the Prophets, ordained these ceremonies, and that far from being disagreeable to Him they were very agreeable, and served as solid testimonies to His purpose and His mission? Did the Jews possess any other testament than the books of the Prophets, which, having traversed the double captivity of Judah and Israel, continued to exist up to the times of our Saviour, and from which, in preaching to the hardened Jews, He drew the major part of His testimonies, as we see from His Gospel? The Jewish people was led into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar, yet

book of Proverbs being taken for the superscription to Ἐκκλησιαστής. The Samatan doubtless represents part of the title ἄσματα ἀσμάτων.

the divine protection did not abandon them, and did not permit them to be dispersed, as we see in our own days. God established them entire in the land which He had decreed. Not only did this people carry with it the Testament, but it was even accompanied by some of the Prophets. Thus Ezekiel says that he found himself on the banks of the river Kebar in the midst of the captives. Also the blessed Ananians were cast into the fiery furnace in Babylon. Moreover the eminent Daniel commenced his prophetic career at Babylon, for it was there that he was cast into the lions' den. There also it was that the events of the history of Esther took place. To convince you that the captives took with them the Testament, I invite your attention to what the Holy Spirit says through the Prophet in the Psalms relative to this enslavement of the Jews. This enslavement had not yet taken place, yet he announces it in an unmistakable manner in Ps. CXXXVI, saying — "We were seated by the rivers of Babylon, and there we wept; we remembered Zion. We hung up our harps on the willows, when those who had taken us prisoners demanded of us that we sing songs, and rejoice them by the sound of our harps that we had hung up, saying to us — 'Sing us some of the songs of Zion.' "

You pretend that the Testament was composed by human genius, and I know that you attack the second edition that Esdras composed.[37] Yet this man possessed the grace of the

[37] He is referring back to the charge of the Caliph that the Old Testament was many times lost, and at a later period recomposed out of men's heads. The "many times lost" doubtless refers to the Rabbinic tale that at three different times in the history of the Jews the Torah was nearly forgotten, but each time a man from Babylon restored it. The first time it was restored by Ezra, the second by Hillel in the time of King Herod, and the third by Rabbi Hiyya the elder, the disciple and friend of R. Jehuda Hannasi, assisted by his sons Hezekiah and Judah (B. Sukkah 20a).

The "recomposing," of course, is the legendary labor of Esdras and his scribes related in II (IV) Esdras cap. xiv, a tale that occurs elsewhere in Muslim apologetic.

The Latin 315b has the charge a little more explicitly — "*et iterum dicis, quia, cum lex Moysi in igne fuisset cremata et renovasset eam Esdras propheta ut potuit ei memoria cordis sui recordari, et non sine mendacio,*" and refers to it again in 321a, — "*quod autem dicis, legem Moysi esse crematam, et quod eam Esdras memoriter et mendaciter memoravit.*" A second reference by Leo (p. 55 of the Armenian text), also recognizes that the Caliph's reference is to the Ezra legend, "you attack the second edition which Esdras composed." The Ezra legend in II (IV) Esdras xiv speaks of the law as having been burned — "lex tua incensa est" (v. 21), and of Ezra's memory being the source of the dictation —

Holy Spirit, and all that he composed has the cachet of infallibility, as is proved by the fact that when all the people, delivered from captivity, came back to Jerusalem, bringing with them the Testament, there was seen the marvellous work of God, for when it was compared with the edition of Esdras, this was found completely in conformity with the former.

You have said that the writers of the Testament, in their quality as men, were exposed to faults of memory. I admit that every man is always feeble in every respect, is imperfect and forgetful. Yet God, who is eternal, whose power is great, and whose wisdom is without limitation, spoke to men by the Prophets, His ministers. He who is exempt from forgetfulness and conjectures, He it is who speaks in the Prophets, without having need of human wisdom. But you, do you not regard your Muḥammad as a man? Yet, relying on the simple word of Muḥammad, you disdain the testimonies of so many saints of God. You say, further, that Satan finds himself near the servants of God. As for God Himself, he does not approach Him, and reasonable people well know that he much rather approaches a person who is deprived completely of the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, than such holy and recommendable people. As concerns the Holy Scriptures this will suffice.

"spiritus meus conservabat memoriam" (v. 40), and of course it was the Holy Spirit's descent which was to enable him to do the work — "inmitte in me spiritum sanctum, et scribam omne quod factum est in saeculo ab initio quae erant in lege tua scripta" (v. 22).

Leo may have derived his knowledge directly from the book in the Apocrypha, but the detail he adds about the confronting of the two texts is curious. His earlier insistence that the "Testament" (i.e. the Torah) went with them to Babylon, is in accord with a Rabbinic tradition to the effect that a copy of the Torah with "crowns" had been buried under the threshold of the Temple, where Ezekiel found it and carried it to Babylon with him, whence it was brought back by Ezra (Sefer ha Tagin in Ginzburg's Massorah, II, 680). As the tradition speaks of its being brought back by Ezra himself, it is clear that an attempt is being made to identify it with "the Law of thy God which is in thy hand" of Ezra VII, 14, 25, 26, so that the reading aloud of the Law mentioned in Nehem. VIII ff. may have been interpreted as the comparison of the old copy from Babylon with the new one produced by Ezra by way of inspiration.

The Latin 321c makes the point that even though Ezra reproduced the matter from memory, this would be nothing against it, since he was a Prophet, and "*in prophetis Dei non est mendacium neque oblivio, quia Deus fit revelatio illorum*," a sentiment which would be universally approved by orthodox Muslims, since according to their teaching, one of the things which cannot be ascribed to Prophets is nisyān, i.e. "forgetfulness."

In saying that there cannot be found in the Mosaic Code any reference to Paradise or Hell or Resurrection or Judgment,[38] you show your unwillingness to comprehend the fact that God has instructed man in the measure that his intelligence has developed. God did not speak with man a single time only, nor by a single Prophet, as you assume in supposing that God would institute through the ministry of Moses all that was necessary. Not at all. What He commanded Noah He did not demand of those who preceded him. Not all that He commanded Abraham did He command Noah, nor all that He commanded Moses did He command Abraham. Not all that He commanded Joshua did He command Moses, and what He commanded Samuel and David and all the other Prophets, in each epoch, He did not command Joshua. And so on, since, as we have already said, God wished to reveal Himself little by little to men, who would have been unable to perceive and appropriate at one single step such marvellous knowledge. So, if God ought to have ordained all by a single Prophet, why should He send others? And if He was going to let everything get falsified, as you pretend, why then ordain it? However, the revelation made by God to Moses was only a sort of preparation for the instruction of men, not a complete instruction. Nevertheless, God does therein make mention of the resurrection, of judgment and of hell. As regards the resurrection, God says — "Behold, now, it is I myself, and there is no God beside Me. I make to die, and I make to live, I wound and I cure, and no one is able to deliver out of My hand." (Deut. XXXII, 39). As regards judgment He says — "I sharpen the blade of My sword, and if My hand seizes the judgment, I will make vengeance turn on My adversaries, and will render it to those who hate Me" (Deut. XXXII, 41). As regards hell He says — "The flaming fire of My wrath will burn them unto the lowest hells" (Jer. XVII, 4). These doctrines received further development and illumination in what came later by other Prophets.

We recognize Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John as authors of

[38] See the Latin 315b, 321b.

the Gospel, and yet I know that this truth, recognized by us Christians, wounds you, so that you seek to find accomplices for your lie.[39] In brief, you admit that we say that it was written by God, and brought down from the heavens, as you pretend for your Furqan, although we know that it was 'Umar, Abū Turāb and Salmān the Persian, who composed that, even though the rumor has got round among you that God sent it down from the heavens.[40] Recognize, then, in that the frank-

[39] The Caliph's problem is that the Injīl (εὐαγγέλιον) mentioned in the Qur'ān as the book of Jesus, must, according to theory, be a book containing the revelations given by God to Jesus for him to proclaim to the people, whereas the Gospel in the hands of the Christians consists of these four Evangelists' accounts of the "Good News" as proclaimed in the words and deeds of Jesus, which is a very different thing.

[40] The orthodox Muslim view, of course, is that the divine original of Scripture is in the heavens, and that the material was revealed piecemeal by the Angel Gabriel to the Prophet over a period of some twenty odd years, the Prophet reciting the passages to the people as they were progressively revealed to him. (Bukhārī, ed. Krehl, II, 410.) In very many passages Allah speaks of revealing this or that to the Prophet, and the common verb used in the Qur'ān in connection with revelation is *nazzala*, *anzala*, *tanazzala*, from a root meaning "to come down," so that there is no doubt that the material was meant to be understood as "sent down from heaven."

In the Qur'ān itself, however, there are hints that Muḥammad's contemporaries knew that he had informants of another faith giving him at least some of his material. In XXV, 5, 6 we have the charge of the Meccans that others had helped him with the production of the Qur'ān, which they said was but "tales of the ancients" that he had had put into writing as they were dictated to him morn and even; and in XVI, 105 the Meccans hint that they know a certain person who taught him the things he claimed to receive by revelation. Numerous suggestions have been made, both by the Muslim commentators, and by Western students, as to who this "mentor" may have been, but in any case that would refer only to odd bits of information or material supplied to Muḥammad for working up into his revelations, not that they were the authors of the book.

The charge that 'Umar, Abū Turāb and Salmān the Persian were the authors of the Qur'ān, however, is peculiar. By 'Umar he means 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, the second Caliph.

Abū Turāb is 'Alī, the son-in-law of the Prophet and the fourth Caliph. The tractate Contra Muhammad, printed at the end of Bartholomew of Edessa's Confutatio in PG, CIV, speaks (col. 1457) of 'Alī as having been the one through whom the Qur'ān was put into circulation.

Salmān al-Fārisī is one of the most curious figures of Islamic history and legend. That he was a historical person, need not be questioned. Possibly he was a Persian slave at Madīna who embraced Islam and put his knowledge at the service of the new faith. His position as a non-Arab Muslim, however, made him conspicuous as "the firstfruits of Persia in Islam," and attracted so much legend to his figure, that even his connection with the famous Ditch is questioned by some critics. Part of this legend connects him with the production of the Qur'ān.

ness of the Christians, and as we profess it, how can you dare invent calumnies, pretending that since that time there have been introduced into the Gospel alterations,[41] whether by us or others? What could have hindered us from removing from it the names of the Evangelists, or from adding that it was God alone who sent it down from the skies? Further, give attention to this fact, that God has not willed to instruct the human race either by His own appearing or by the mission of angels.[42] He has chosen the way of sending them Prophets, and it is for this reason that the Lord, having finished all those things that He had decided on beforehand, and having fore-announced His incarnation by way of His Prophets, yet knowing that men still had need of assistance from God, promised to send the Holy Spirit, under the name of Paraclete, (Consoler), to console them in the distress and sorrow they felt at the departure of their Lord and Master. I reiterate, that it was for this cause alone that Jesus called the Holy Spirit the Paraclete, since He sought to console His disciples for His departure, and recall to them all that He had said, all that He had done before their eyes, all that they were called to propagate throughout the world by their witness. Paraclete thus signifies "consoler," while Muḥammad means "to give thanks," or "to render grace," a meaning which has no connection whatever with the word Paraclete.[43]

[41] The commonest charge of alterations in the Gospel is that the name of Muḥammad was there, but the Christians removed it. The remark about removing the names of the Evangelists refers to the Muslim claim, mentioned before, that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John prove the Gospels to be the words of men not the word of God, or, as the Muslim objector in Bartholomew of Edessa says (col. 1384c) — Διὰ τί τὸ κατελθὸν Εὐαγγέλιον ἐκρύψατε, καὶ νέον ἐγράψατε;

[42] In the Qur'ān there are many references to the expectation that an angel should be the agent of revelation, or of instruction from God.

[43] The Caliph's question as to whether Jesus had not in the Gospel, in speaking about the Paraclete, referred to the coming of Muḥammad, goes back to the Qur'ānic verse LXI, 6, "And when Jesus, son of Mary, said — O Children of Israel, I am the messenger of Allah to you, confirming the Torah now present, and announcing a messenger to come after me, whose name is Aḥmad." The name Aḥmad is from the same root as the name Muḥammad, both meaning much the same thing, "the praised," and the common supposition is that the statement refers back to the promise of the Paraclete in John XIV, 16, 26; XV, 26; XVI, 7. But see the discussion by A. Fischer, "Muḥammad und Aḥmad, die Namen des arabischen Propheten," in Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, LXXXIV (1932), Heft. 3,

Whatever the origin of this may have been, the claim that the promise of the Para-

This blasphemy, in fact, is unpardonable, as the Lord Himself says in the Gospel — "Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will never be forgiven" (Matt. XII, 31). Can there be a blasphemy more terrible than that which consists in replacing the Holy Spirit by a person completely ignorant of the Holy Scriptures? To comprehend that the Lord, in this passage, was speaking of the Holy Spirit, give heed to what He says — "The Comforter, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name, will teach you all things, and will recall to your remembrance all the things that I have told you" (John XVI, 26). A little further on He adds — "whom the Father will send in my name," whereas your Muḥammad did not come in the name of our Lord, but in his own name. Jesus promised the Holy Spirit to the saints, that is, to His own disciples, not to men in general, and you know well that His disciples did not live to see your Muḥammad. I have already said that the Creator spread abroad the light of His knowledge by His Prophets successively, little by little, and yet, even by them all, He did not achieve all the justice that was to come. By the ministry of the Prophet Daniel God has pointed us to three periods whereby the world shall arrive at a really satisfactory knowledge of God. First it comes out of the shadows of idolatry, and it arrives at a certain degree of knowledge by the Law. From that it passes to the clearer light of the Gospel of Christ, and finally, from the Gospel to the perpetual light of the world to come. None of the Prophets has announced to the world a fourth period, whether for doctrine or for the promises. On the contrary we are ofttimes warned by our Saviour not to admit any other Prophet nor any Apostle after the death of His disciples.

You pretend, moreover, that after the death of the disciples

---

clete was fulfilled in Muḥammad is prominent in Muslim thought. Timothy in his Apology before al-Mahdī (Mingana in Woodbrooke Studies, II, 33–35) is at pains to prove the Muslim claim wrong, and almost every polemical writing in this field contains some account of the matter (see Fritzsch 90 ff.). Some sought to explain the reference as a deliberate deception of Muḥammad by the renegade monk who was his mentor. Thus the Syriac writer Isho'yabh in the Christian Bahira Legend edited by Gottheil in ZA, XIII, tells us (on p. 213) how the scribe Kaleb (= Ka'b), who came after Sergius, taught the Muslims that Muḥammad himself was the Paraclete.

of the Lord, we became divided into seventy-two sects.[44] This is not true, so do not think to console yourself by this lie. Let me explain this to you. According to your own people, it is a hundred years,[45] more or less, since your religion appeared in the midst of a single nation speaking a single language. Yet this religion, so young, and professed by a single nation, already presents numerous schisms, a few of which we shall mention here as having come to our notice. Look then at the Kouzi, the Sabari, the Tourapi, the Kentri, the Mourji, the Basli, further the Jahdi, who deny both the existence of God, and the resurrection, along with your pretended Prophet, and the Hariuri. One group of these sectaries is peaceable enough, but the others are so stirred up against you, that they consider you both as infidels and enemies, considering the assassination of your persons preferable to any other justice, and regarding death at your hands as the foremost of meritorious works. Such acts take place habitually amongst you. As for you yourself, have you no thought that by exterminating those who differ a little from your opinions, you commit a crime against God?[46] If such acts

[44] The Caliph's question was doubtless based on his memory of the Muslim tradition as to the seventy-two sects of the Christians, not on anything he had learned from Christian sources.

The splitting up into sects is a matter for which the Jews and Christians are blamed in the Qur'ān, indeed (XXX, 31; XLII, 11), but the number seventy belongs only to the tradition.

[45] The hundred years since the religion of Islam appeared would be accurate for Leo writing in 718, for August 3rd of that year saw the beginning of the year 100 A.H., a year specially marked by the Muslims, as we know from the Annalists, because it was expected to be a year of great portent for the Islamic religion and empire.

[46] The identification of these Muslim sects is not simple. The names are given in the same order, though with slight orthographical variations, in Vartan (p. 53 of the text as printed in Muyldermans, La Domination Arabe), who almost certainly took them from a MS of Ghevond. In each case we have to assume, of course, that the Armenian name is an attempt at transliterating a Greek form, which itself may not be a very accurate representation of the Arabic original.

The *Ḳawzi* (Vardan *Ḳouzi*) are doubtless the Khawārij, as Chahnazarian suggests. They were the political puritans of Islam, who created much trouble all through the days of the Umayyad Caliphate.

The *Sabari* (Vardan *Sabri*), whom Chahnazarian would identify with the Jubbā'ites, followers of Abū 'Alī al-Jubbā'ī (†915), are perhaps rather the Jabarites, who with the Murjiites presently to be mentioned, formed one of the earliest known sects of Islam.

The *Ṫourapi* (Vardan *Ṫouṙabi*) are doubtless some 'Alid sect, since 'Alī himself was

take place among you, who form one single people speaking a single language, and having at your head a single person, who is at the same time chief, sovereign, pontiff and hangman, would it be astonishing that the Christian faith, were it the invention of some human wisdom, should become worse than yours? Yet it is now eight hundred years since Jesus Christ appeared, and His Gospel has been spread from one end of the earth to the other, amongst all peoples and all languages, from the civilized countries of Greece and Rome to the furthest countries of the barbarians, and if there is found some divergence among Christians it is because of the differences of language. I have said divergence, because there has never been among us that bitter hostility such as one sees deeply rooted among you. It would appear that under this number seventy-two you

---

known as Abū Turāb (see Nöldeke in ZDMG, LII, 29 ff. on the name), and his Shī'ite followers often named Turābīyya.

The *Kntri* may be, as Chahnazarian suggests, the Qadarites, who appear with the Murjiites and the Jabarites as among the earliest sects of Islam. They were so named because they believed in free-will, and that man had power (*qadar*) over his actions. They were the predecessors of the Mu'tazilites.

The *Mourǰi* are quite obviously the Murji'ites or "postponers," who withheld judgment till they could see how Allah would pronounce on the Last Day.

The *Basłi* (Vardan *Basli*) must be the Mu'tazilites, or at least a group of them, the name deriving from the famous Wāṣil b. 'Aṭā' (†131 A.H. = 748 A.D.), whose separation from his master al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī is a story famous in the books of Muslim theology.

The *J̌ahdi* (Vardan *J̌hdi*) would seem to be the Jāḥiẓites, the followers of the "goggle-eyed" Mu'tazilite teacher of Baṣra, Abū 'Amr b. Baḥr al-Jāḥiẓ, who died in 869. It is hardly true to say, as Ghevond does, that he denied the existence of God and the resurrection, though the thoroughgoing philosophical scepticism of Jāḥiẓ, and his clever mockery of much that the orthodox taught both about Allah and the hereafter, may well have sounded like a denial of both.

The *Hariuri* (Vardan *Hariri*) Chahnazarian would identify with the Khurrāmiyya, followers of Bābak al-Khurrāmī, the son of an Aramaic-speaking oil-seller of Ctesiphon, who appeared in 816, and for some twenty years terrorized W. and N. W. Persia, claiming to be a theophany, and to reincarnate the spirit of Jāwīdān. Or failing this he would see in them the Ḥulūlite sects who taught that God's spirit continues to incarnate amongst men (see Baghdādī, Farq, 241 ff.). It is much more likely, however, that the reference is to the Ḥarūriyya, a name for the Khārijites, or portion thereof, given them from the town of Ḥarūra or Ḥaraurā', outside Kūfa, where the Khawārij retired when 'Alī returned to Kūfa from the battle of Siffīn. They are often called Ḥarūriyya in the theological tractates and also in ordinary historical references. They would best fit the description of Ghevond of being so fierce against the orthodox that they would willingly kill them as infidels and enemies, and consider it most meritorious to die fighting against them.

must include all the voluptuous, impure, filthy, impious people who conduct themselves like pagans, and among whose number you count us. But these are people who disguise under the name of Christ their own abominations, giving themselves out to be Christians, but whose faith is only a blasphemy, and their baptism only a soiling. When such manifest their intention of abandoning their detestable life, the Holy Church receives them into her bosom only after administering baptism to them, just as to pagans. Indeed, God has long since caused them to disappear completely, so that one no longer sees them.

As for us we are accustomed to designate the Christians as seventy races, which have all received holy baptism, the gage of eternal life. If among them some questions of minor importance cause agitation, especially among some of them who live far from us and speak a tongue other than ours; above all those who have fallen under your tyranny, yet they are none the less Christians, and have no need to be baptized anew. In any case it is nothing strange that Christians, who live as foreigners afar off, have not been able to acquire a closer acquaintance with the traditions of the truth, such as they ought to have. Yet the Scriptures are the same, conserved intact in each language; and the Gospel is the same, without any variation. I leave on one side, then, the various languages in which the wondrous and salutary Christian religion has been spread abroad, after indicating a few of them — (1) our Greek language; (2) the Latin; (3) the Hebrew; (4) the Chaldaean; (5) that of the Syrians; (6) that of the Ethiopians; (7) that of the Indians; (8) that of the Saracens, which is yours; (9) that of the Persians; (10) that of the Armenians; (11) that of the Georgians; and (12) that of the Albanians.[47] Suppose, following what you say, that one or two of these peoples had introduced changes in the books in their respective languages, how can one suppose that these changes are to be found also in the books of other peoples, dwelling as you well know, far from us, and differing from us both in their language and their peculiar habits. As for your (book), you have already given us examples of such

[47] This list of languages is that of the 1887 text, which differs somewhat from that of 1857.

falsifications, and one knows, among others, of a certain Ḥajjāj, named by you as Governor of Persia, who had men gather up your ancient books, which he replaced by others composed by himself, according to his taste, and which he propagated everywhere in your nation, because it was easier by far to undertake such a task among a people speaking a single language. From this destruction, nevertheless, there escaped a few of the works of Abū Turāb, for Ḥajjāj could not make them disappear completely.[48]

[48] This is a rather confused reference to the work of al-Ḥajjāj on the text of the Qur'ān. The orthodox Muslim theory assumes that the text as canonized by 'Uthmān was the final canonization, but there is reason to believe that a recension of 'Uthmān's text was made by the direction of al-Ḥajjāj, so that we only know of the text of 'Uthmān in this later recension. This fact was apparently well known to Oriental Christian writers, for al-Kindī in his Apology (Risāla, p. 78), speaks of al-Ḥajjāj not leaving a single Codex that he did not gather up, and left out many things, and of how he sent out copies of his new recension, and directed his attention to destroying the older Codices. This statement of al-Kindī has always been looked at askance as a piece of Christian polemic, but we know from Ibn 'Asākir (Tārīkh, IV, 82) that one of al-Ḥajjāj's claims to fame was his being instrumental in giving the Qur'ān to the people, and from Ibn Duqmāq (Intiṣār, IV, 72) we know of the commotion in Egypt when a Codex from those which al-Ḥajjāj had had officially written out to be sent to the chief cities of the Muslim Empire, reached that country. As there were stories about al-Ḥajjāj being connected with the earliest attempts at putting diacritical marks in the Qur'ānic text to make its readings more certain (Ibn Khallikān I, 183 quoting Abū Aḥmad al-'Askarī), and also with the earliest attempts at dividing the text into sections (Ibn Abī Dāwūd, Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif, p. 119 in my Materials), it might be suggested that this recension of his was merely an improved edition of the 'Uthmānic text, which he had had prepared, and copies of which he had had sent out as the edition to be officially used. Such a suggestion would also suit the story in the as yet unprinted Mushkil of Ibn Qutaiba, that he ordered the destruction of all the Codices representing a text earlier than that canonized by 'Uthmān, and with his well-known enmity towards the famous text of Ibn Mas'ūd (Ibn 'Asākir, IV, 69; Ibn al-Athīr Chronicon, IV, 463). In Ibn Abī Dāwūd (pp. 49, 117), however, we have a list of eleven passages, on the authority of no less a person than Abu Ḥātim as-Sijistānī, where our present text is said to be that of al-Ḥajjāj, arrived at by tampering with the earlier text. It would thus seem that some revision of the text, as well as clarification by division and pointing, was undertaken by al-Ḥajjāj, and that this was known to the Christians of that day, and naturally exaggerated by them for polemical purposes. As this work would seem to have been done by al-Ḥajjāj during his period of office under the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān, who died in 86 A.H. = 705 A.D., there is no difficulty in supposing that Leo may have heard of it during his official life in Syria.

His remark about a few of the works of Abū Turāb having escaped may refer to works, such as collections of Proverbs, etc. which were ascribed to 'Alī, and as such circulated in the East, or it may merely refer to Codices of the Qur'ān which he knew had escaped the general destruction ordered by al-Ḥajjāj.

Such a thing as this would have been impossible among us. First of all because God has forbidden us to dream of such an audacious enterprise. Secondly, because even if someone, in spite of God's prohibition, had dared so to act, it would have been impossible for him to have gathered up all the books spread abroad in so many different languages, procured and brought together skilled interpreters, and have had these interpreters examine the books, so as to add and subtract according to his idea. For the rest, as you are well aware, since you mention the fact, there exists among the Christians a sort of enmity, regarding questions of little import, it is true, but sufficient to be capable of inspiring each nation with the notion of introducing changes into the books in its language according to its opinions. Yet no such thing has taken place, neither amongst those who find themselves far from us, nor among those who live in lands near us. Cease then to multiply such inanities, lest you nullify the little truth there is in what you advance.

One thing about you, indeed, astonishes me more than a little. It is that after you have shown such disdain with regard to the Gospel of our Saviour, and the books of the Prophets, regarding them as falsified and as recomposed by men according to their ideas, you nevertheless, in order to support your own inconstant opinions, cease not to draw citations therefrom, which you twist and modify at will. Whenever, for example, you come across the word *Father*, you replace it by *Lord*, or sometimes by *God*. If you are making your researches in the interests of truth, you ought to respect the Scriptures before citing them. Or, if you disdain them as corrupt, you ought not to use them for citation, and if you do cite them, it is an obligation on you to cite them such as you find them in the books, without modifying them in the way you do.

It is very difficult, as a matter of fact, for the servants of God who are under your command, to have any relations with you. Pagans, when they hear the names of the Prophets or Apostles, begin to laugh, but you, though you do not despise their names, turn their words into ridicule. Let us, however, cite to you the following passages addressed to Moses: "I am the Eternal . . . the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the

God of Jacob" (Ex. III, 14); "Let us make man in our own image, according to our resemblance" (Gen. I, 26); "Come then, let us go down and confound their language" (Gen. XI, 7). Again — "The Eternal rained down from heaven, on Sodom and Gomorrah, sulphur and fire from the Eternal" (Gen. XIX, 24). These I quote from the books of Moses which you have not read, neither you nor your legislator. What! do you believe that it is to angels, who dare not look upon Him, that the Eternal is addressing the above-mentioned words? We do not permit ourselves to think, as you so often do, that such passages as these from Holy Scripture are empty and futile. To whom then could it be that God is addressing these words, if it is not to His Word, the image of His substance, the ray of the light of His glory, and to the Holy Spirit, who sanctifies and enlightens all? And yet we are accused by you of recognizing three gods.[49]

Is the sun different from the rays which derive from it? Yes, without doubt. Yet take away these rays and there is no more sun. And if anyone says that the rays generate directly from the sun, and from it alone, without the concourse of any other power, in a way different from the generation of humans, which proceeds from the coupling of the sexes, that, in a word, it draws them out from its own proper substance, such an one so saying would not be deceiving himself. In effect, though the sun is other than its rays, their union does not make two suns. Is not that your opinion too? So, if this light, visible and created, which the night obscures, which the height of buildings intercepts, seems to us to proceed from a birth so pure, what will be the purity of a divine birth, which proceeds from a light whose eternal splendor nothing dims? [50]

[49] The Latin deals with this charge in 317a. Again it is a Qur'ānic charge that the Caliph is preferring, for in IV, 169 the Christians are bidden "say not three," and in v. 77 of the next Sūra, those who say "Allah is the third of three," are classed among the unbelievers. The wording of Sūra V, 116, "O Jesus, son of Mary, was it Thou who didst say to the people — 'Take Me and my mother as gods apart from Allah?'," suggests that Muḥammad thought of the Christian Trinity as parallel to the numerous Near Eastern triads of Father, Mother, Son.

In the Latin 317a the question of the engendering of the Son is brought out a little more specifically — "*Pater non est genitus, Filius est genitus, Spiritus sanctus non est genitus necque ingenitus*," apparently having in mind the Qur'ānic passage CXII, 3, "He begetteth not and is not begotten."

[50] This illustration from the sun is given somewhat differently by the Latin 316c.

I was driven to make use of this example in order to convince you, because it seemed to me that you give little heed to what God orders us in the Holy Scriptures, as you prefer your own will to them. From them you take what pleases you, fearing not to modify them at your caprice, changing what is not in accordance with your views. Maledictions upon any man who admits two or three divinities emanating from different origins. For our part, we know only one God, the Creator of heaven and earth, a wise God, whose Word, holy and full of reason, created all things and governs them. And this Word is not as ours, which, as long as it has not proceeded from our mouths, remains incomprehensible to others, and as soon as it has gone out, decomposes and dissipates. This Word is what we recognize as the Word of God, the ray of light that nothing dims, a ray which is not simply like those of the sun, but is of a quality so eminent as to disconcert the intelligence and evade explanation. It is this Word which Scripture calls the Son of God, engendered by Him not under the dominance of passion such as is of earth, but as the rays are born from the sun, as light goes out from fire, as the word emanates from the reason. In sum, this is all that human language can say with regard to the Word-God, emanated from God, and as to their consubstantiality.

Now among creatures, there is no being more precious before God than man, as you yourself avow in mentioning that the angels were commanded by God to bow the knee to Adam, a fact unknown to the Holy Scriptures.[51] Adam was a man, and in rendering him such homage, you have well evidenced your pride, so let everyone know what place they ought to occupy, who are unwilling to render homage to the Man, according to your own expression.[52] It is evident that Adam was

[51] The story of the angels being commanded to bow down to Adam is in Sūra II, 32 (cf. XVII, 63; XVIII, 48; XX, 115), which is the story of the fall of Iblīs through his refusal to obey this command.

[52] This is the beginning of his argument in reply to the objection that the Christians are in error in adoring Christ. The Latin 320c on this point points out that the Children of Israel adored the Ark (doubtless referring to II Chron. V, 6 ff.), and yet in so doing they were not adoring the wood of the Ark, but the Law, the Word of God, which was in the Ark (I Ki. VIII, 9), so since the angels were commanded to adore the newly created Adam, why should one not adore the incarnate Word? Then it asks whether

created in the image of God, but do you believe that it was his material body full of infirmities which God created in His image? Not at all. On the contrary, it was his soul, reason and word which God created in the image of His Spirit and His Word. Man, being created in this manner and receiving honor and independence, became the image of God. But later, deceived by the Tempter, he was robbed of the honor for which he was destined by his Creator, and being now a despised creature because of his blameworthy forgetfulness, he abandoned himself to a life of most blameworthy debauchery and luxury. Voluptuousness became his unique occupation, and his whole life came to present nothing but a tissue of hatred, rapine, assassination and avidity, and he ended up by plunging into idolatry, which is the summation of all iniquities, and into such voluptuousness as I am ashamed to speak of here. In this aberration he set about worshipping not only fantastic visible entities, but even his vices, adultery, sodomy, to which he rendered divine honors. Thus did the Tempter succeed in reducing humanity to such degradation, and he rejoices in triumph at seeing himself adored under the form of the idols of paganism, and in exciting voluptuous man more and more to this perverse cult by auguries and deceitful talismans.

God, however, seeing His image so degraded by this adora-

---

it is not better to adore Him than some deaf stone at Mecca, which is but a relic of ancient heathenism. The reference, of course, is to the Shrine at Mecca with its sacred Black Stone. The "*idololatria illa qua adorabant Jaoh, Jaoc, Nazara, et Allac et Allogei et Mena, quidam ex eis erant dei in similitudine virorum, quaedam in similitudine feminarum*," is a reference to Sūra LIII, 19, 20, which mentions the three goddesses Al-Lāt, al-'Uzzā and Manāt, all of which were in female form, and Sūra LXXI, 23, which mentions the ancient Arab deities Yaghūth, Ya'ūq and Nasr. His following sentence, however, is difficult to understand — "*Majores horum, dicebantur Aleubre, unde et sermo iste derivatur, Alacuiber, inter vos immolentes eis pecora et camelos in uno die pro unoquoque anno.*" If we can suppose *Aleubre* to be a misprint for *Alcubra*, then the two words may be the two superlatives, masc. and fem. *al-kubrā* and *al-akbar*, "the greatest," used in titles of the original male and female deity of the shrine, i.e. the Hubal and 'Uzzā whom we learn figured together in the pagan Meccan war-cry. The sacrifice of cattle and camels at the Meccan shrine in pre-Islamic times is well attested. He then goes on, "*et secuti estis consuetudinem paganorum super lapide illo, in Mecha, in angulo domus ipsius idololatriae, cui serviebat antiquitas paganorum, et immolabat*," referring to the Black Stone (*al-ḥajar al-aswad*), which is set in the outside southern corner of the Ka'ba (Rif'at Pāsha, Mir'at al-Ḥaramain, I, 132 ff.; 300 ff.).

tion rendered the Tempter, and by the abasement into which man had fallen in doing that which was pleasing to Satan, was touched by compassion for man's misery, for He alone is the true benefactor and friend of humanity. And, as there existed no other road of salvation for man than that of coming to know his Creator and to flee from his enemy, He manifested Himself to man to this end, making Himself known at first through intermediary of the Prophets, His ministers, as by a light which shines little by little in the midst of the darkness of paganism. So great was the blindness of man's spirit that he could not contemplate fully all at once the whole of the knowledge of God, for which reason God commenced, as I have noted above, by illuminating it little by little, until the right time arrived. Thus God enlightened man by as much as He found good for him, but promised him in advance, through the Prophets, the coming of His incarnate Word, who should clothe Himself with our flesh and our soul and all that is proper to man, save sin.[53]

As no one among men has been able to descend lower than He in humiliation, we attribute to Him all that has been said as to His lowering Himself; and, on the other hand, all that has been said as to His glory, we attribute to Him as to one who is veritably God. You will probably recall what we reported above from the books of Moses, concerning the equality of the Word of God with God Himself. Hearken now, to what Moses further says relative to the future appearance of the Word clothed in a human form. "The Eternal, thy God, will raise up a prophet from among thy brethren, to whom you will hearken as to Me . . . and he will tell them all that I have commanded. And it will so be that whoever will not hearken to My words which he will speak in My name, I shall demand it of him" (Deut. XVIII, 15, 18, 19). Everyone knows, it is true, that since the death of Moses, instead of but one single prophet, there have appeared a great number. Nevertheless the passage before us can apply to but one, namely, he who is the most powerful of them, and who announces things difficult to believe. Now I

[53] The substance of the argument of God's remedy for the sad state of sinful man is that of the Latin 319. The following Scripture "proof texts," while by no means the same as are used in the Latin in 317 ff., are of the same general type.

shall cite you a multitude of passages from the Prophets, indicating the coming of Christ, and I prefer to set before you first those which speak of Him in terms of humiliation, in the conviction that you will welcome such with much pleasure. In this manner, I hope that I shall succeed in raising you, if God will, as by a stairway, from the profound depths of this earth, to places most elevated, even to the presence of God.

David, speaking of Him, says, as being in His place: "But I, I am a worm, and not a man, opprobrious to men and despised of the people. All those who see me make mock of me; they sniff at me, they shake their heads. He abandons himself, they say, to the Eternal; let Him deliver him, and take him away, since He takes pleasure in him" (Ps. XXII, 6–8). This prophecy was not accomplished in David, but in the person of the Lord, when He was hanging on the cross. The same David speaks of Christ in eminent terms; "The Eternal has said to me; Thou art My son, this day have I begotten thee" (Ps. II, 7). To indicate the complete conversion of all the pagans to the Christian faith, the same Prophet adds: "The Eternal hath said to my Lord; Sit thou at my right hand, till I have made thy enemies the footstool for thy foot. . . . The people will be a people of free volition, in the day when thou assemblest thy army with holy pomp; the dew of thy youth will be produced for thee from the breast of the morning" (Ps. CX, 1, 2). The same Prophet expresses himself thus on the unity of the divine nature (the holy Trinity seated in the heavens): "The earth is full of the gratuity of the Eternal; the heavens have been made by the Word of the Eternal, and all their host by the breath of His mouth" (Ps. XXXII, 5 and 6).

Jeremiah expresses himself thus: "The Lord sent me, and His Spirit" (Isa. XLVIII, 16). He also says, concerning the incarnation of the Word of God: "He is our God, and He has found all the paths of wisdom, and has given it to Jacob His servant, and to Israel His favourite; then He appeared in the world and walked with men" (Baruch III, 35–37). In this passage the Prophet indicates two kinds of light; the first is that of His extreme abasement, whereby He illuminated the entire universe, by propagating therein the rays of the knowl-

edge of God; and the second is that of the general resurrection that He announced to the Hebrew people, exhorting it to remain faithful to the first rising of that light, and not to revolt against it (as really took place), for fear lest strangers, that is to say pagans, should enter into possession of their glory. He then says to them: "Return, O Jacob, and hold on to him during the birth of his first light, and give not thy glory or interest to another" (Baruch IV, 2, 3). I call your attention to this passage, for in it the Prophet announces not only the future incarnation of the Word of God, but also predicts there in the clearest manner the future revolt of the carnal people of Israel.

This prophecy does not prevent us from receiving yet another, made, in spite of himself, by a stranger, and mentioned by Moses: "How beautiful are thy tabernacles, O Jacob, and thy pavilions, O Israel" (Numb. XXIV, 5), and a little further on he adds, "water will distill from its waters, and his seed will be among the grand waters, and its king will be elevated above Agag, and its kingdom very highly elevated" (v. 7); and again, "I see him, but not now; I regard him, but not from near. A star will be born of Jacob, and a sceptre will be raised up in Israel; he will transpierce the chiefs of Moab and destroy all the children of Seth" (v. 17). This prophecy speaks of Him as a man, yet you see well how in precise fashion it indicates the future domination He will exercise over the pagans; that is to say, all the peoples must believe in Him, as you see for yourself. Under the name of the chiefs of Moab, one may understand Satan and all his demons, who maintain the mendacious cult of idolatry among the peoples, finally beaten and superseded by Christ, since the polytheism of the Moabites and those peoples subject to their dominion was more detestable than that of all the other peoples, since they adored, among other things, the genitals of man and woman, instruments of the most detestable voluptuousness.[54] As for what he says about

[54] That the Moabitish worship was of a licentious character is suggested by such Old Testament passages as Numb. XXV, and the Moabite Stone with its reference to 'Ashtar-Chemosh, suggests the Baal and consort worshipped with licentious rites at the "high places," but we have no evidence to support the precise charge in the text as to the forms of the images. Later Rabbinic writers commenting on Numb. XXI,

"he will be elevated above Agag," it is necessary to recall that, whatever may be the extent of Agag and his force, his power is but temporary, while that of Christ will be eternal.

That the empire of Christ really is such you will see if you give attention to the words of the Holy Spirit on this matter, when He says through David: "O God, give Thy judgments to the king, and Thy justice to the king's son" (Ps. LXXII, 1). That shows that Christ was, by His divinity, Son of God, the celestial King, and by His human character as son of David, terrestrial king, as we have often told you. A little further on the Prophet adds — "They will fear Thee as long as the sun and moon endure throughout all ages . . . indeed, He will dominate from one sea to the other, and from the river to the ends of the earth. . . . All kings also will prostrate themselves before Him, all nations will serve Him. . . . Prayers will be made continually for Him, and each day He will be blessed. . . . His renown will endure for ever, His renown will go from father to son, as long as the sun shall endure; and people will be blessed in Him; all nations shall proclaim Him blessed" (Ps. LXXII, 5, 8, 11, 15, 17). Can one, after having heard expressions so sublime, attribute them without trembling to an ordinary man, a descendant of David, and not to Him who, in His human nature is son of David, but in His divine nature is Son of God and Word of God; and who in the end must reign, not by force of arms, or by pitiless effusion of blood, nor by enslaving, but by pacific faith, as is indicated still more clearly in the following passage of the Psalm: "In His time shall justice flourish, and there shall be an abundance of peace till there be no more moon" (v. 7).

God also further announced the Messiah through Micah in these terms — "But thou, Bethlehem-Ephratha, although small among the thousands of Judah, from thee shall come out one unto Me to be he who dominates in Israel; and his issuing forth is from of old, even from eternal days" (Micah V, 2). Is the issue of some simple man to be dated as from eternal days? Hear yet another prediction which God makes to us by the

29, tell us that the idol of the Moabites was a black stone in female form (Midrash Lekach Tob, ed. Padua, Wilna, 1884, in loc.).

mouth of Jeremiah: "The heart is guileful and desperately wicked above all things, who can know it? O Eternal, Thou art the expectation of Israel. All those who abandon Thee will be ashamed. Those who turn away from Me shall be written in the earth, because they have left the source of living water, the Eternal One" (Jer. XVII, 9, 13). Under the name Israel one must not understand the obstinate Jews, but those who have seen the Word of God, and have believed that He was God engendered of God, because in the Hebrew language the word Israel signifies *clairvoyant.*[55] This explanation is given the word by God Himself in a passage in Isaiah, where He says — "The infant is born unto us, the son has been given us, the empire has been set on His shoulder, and His name shall be called Admirable, Counsellor, God mighty and powerful, the Father of Eternity, the prince of peace, the Angel of the great mystery" (Isa. IX, 5). He is called *Angel* by reason of His human character completely pure and admirable; *Counsellor* and *Mighty God*, are expressions of His divine nature. Then the Prophet adds — "There shall be no end to the growth of His kingdom and prosperity on the throne of David, and on His reign, to affirm it and establish it in justice and judgment, from now on and for always" (v. 6). Now it is well known that Jesus did not mount the throne of David, and did not reign over Israel, because this has no reference to a temporary throne, but to that of which God had spoken to David in these terms: "I will make thy prosperity eternal, and I will see to it that thy throne shall be as the days of the heavens" (Ps. LXXXIX, 29). Someone may now ask, what is this throne of David? and how is it eternal and as the days of the heavens? Without doubt it is the celestial empire of Christ, who as to His human nature was a son of David, as had been announced in so precise a manner by Isaiah, — "There will be no end to the growth of

[55] The name יִשְׂרָאֵל = "may El strive," is explained in Gen. XXXII, 28; Hos. XII, 4 as "wrestler with El," but from the later pronunciation of the name, represented in the Greek and Syriac forms with initial א, there grew up the conceit that it was made up of the three elements איש ראה אל = "man who saw God." From Philo's *Ἰσράηλ, ὅπερ ἑρμηνευθὲν ἐστιν . . ὁρῶν θεόν*" — (de Abrahamo, 12, cf. de congressu eruditionis gratia, 10), the idea passed to the Greek ecclesiastical writers, and was doubtless the common understanding of the name in Leo's day.

His kingdom and prosperity on the throne of David, and on His reign, to affirm it and establish it in justice and judgment, from now on and for ever" (Isa. IX, 7). This passage leads us to see that the most powerful and most glorious empire of Christ, the son of David by His human nature, will be in the heavens, where He will transport His eternal and inaccessible kingdom.

Nor must one neglect what Isaiah says in regard to this: "Behold, a virgin who will become pregnant and will bring forth a son, and his name shall be called Emanuel" (Isa. VII, 14). I have still many other passages I might cite on this subject, but, that I may not weary you, I have preferred to limit them. Nevertheless, I beseech you, hearken to some citations regarding His extreme humiliation in the sufferings which He voluntarily supported, in accordance with the previous indication thereof by the Prophets. The Holy Spirit, by the instrumentality of Isaiah, speaks thus: "I have not been rebellious, and have not retired backwards. I have exposed my back to those who smote me, and my cheeks to those who pulled out my hairs. I have not hidden my face from insults nor from being spat upon" (Isa. L, 5, 6). Also through Zechariah, He speaks: "And I said to them, if it seem good to you give me my hire; if not, give it me not. Then they weighed my hire, which was twenty pieces of silver" (Zech. XI, 12). This prediction, along with all the others, was fulfilled in the person of the Saviour. He was sold by His disciple, and handed over to death, as the evangelists have preserved record, which you may examine as carefully as you wish and will find it such as we have presented it to you. Among many others David thus predicted the sufferings of Christ — "He who was at peace with me, whom I trusted, and who ate my bread, has lifted up his heel against me" (Psa. XLI, 9). Isaiah speaks of the same subject in a more detailed manner, saying — (Here he quotes Isa. LIII, 1–9 at length.)

Dare you then, relying on the bare word of your Muḥammad, deny and give the lie to so many testimonies of the Holy Spirit, set forth by the Prophets His ministers? You must at least conform to the prescription of your legislator, who commands that nothing be affirmed unless verified by two wit-

nesses.[56] Indeed this is one of the more important regulations. How then, have you not shame, in dependence on the sole word of your prophet, to utter so evident a blasphemy? Is it that you have forgotten, though maybe you are hardly aware of it, the tremendous imposture credited by your prophet, according to whom Miriam, the daughter of Amram, and sister of Aaron, was the mother of our Lord,[57] whereas between the first Miriam and the second there was a space of 1370 years and thirty-two generations? If you had a countenance that was sensitive and not of stone, truly you would have had to blush at such impostures absolutely without foundation. The Christ, according to the promise of God, ought to come from the tribe of Judah, whereas Miriam, the daughter of Amram, belonged to that of Levi. Your objections are full of inconsequences, and offer nothing but a multitude of gross and inadmissible falsifications. The source of so many such subterfuges and contradictions is naught but purely human invention, but I shall endeavor, by the aid of the little seal of truth, to bottle it up.

With regard to the Mosaic Code, the Psalms and the Gospel, you pretend that the Hebrews and ourselves have altered them,[58] though you recognize that these books are of divine origin. Suppose we admit for the moment that ours have been falsified and corrupted. Where, pray, are yours, in which you place credence? Show us other books of Moses or the Prophets, Psalms of David, or the Gospels, that we may see them.[59] This

[56] For this question of the two witnesses see note 33.

[57] The passages in question are Sūra XIX, 29 where the mother of Jesus is called the sister of Aaron, and LXVI, 12, where she is called "daughter of 'Imrān." The Latin 315b. c. does not make this point about the thirty-two generations that had elapsed between the two Miriams, but merely says that the one Miriam died in the desert before they entered the promised land. It then goes on to make the further point that the first Miriam was of the tribe of Levi, whereas the mother of Jesus was of the tribe of Judah.

[58] See notes 21 and 37.

[59] In the Qur'ān Jesus is represented as saying things which are not to be found in any Gospel, canonical or apocryphal, but which, according to Muslim theory, would presumably have been found in the Gospel to which Muḥammad refers, which is why Leo further on asks that this Gospel be cited.

The reason Leo mentions specifically the Torah, Psalms and Gospel, is that these three alone are mentioned in the Qur'ān, and the challenge to produce other books of Moses, David and Jesus, if those which are in the hands of the People of the Book are not genuine, must have been early made, for there have been attempts to answer the

imposture is the most monstrous and most ignoble. At the very least you will have to admit that even you have never seen them. But do you, who lovest to pry into the Gospel that we possess, in order to find some citations that you can then produce, after forcing them and altering them,[60] do you still pretend that we have falsified them? At least cite this Gospel which your legislator knew, and then I shall be convinced that you speak the truth.

There is only one single faith, you say. Yea, doubtless, there is but one faith, one baptism, than which no other faith or commandment has been given men by God. Then you reproach us for not turning, when we pray, to the region indicated by the Code,[61] and for not communicating as the legislation ordains. This objection is completely vain and full of folly. The region to which the Prophets turned when they made their prayers is not known. It is you alone who are carried away to venerate the pagan altar of sacrifice that you call the House of Abraham.[62] Holy Scripture tells us nothing about Abraham having gone to the place which afterwards, according to the order of Muḥammad, became the centre of adoration of your co-religionists. As to the sacrament of the Communion you will have my response later on.

---

challenge by producing such. The point of the usual Muslim objection to the Scriptures at present in the hands of Jews and Christians, is that a Scripture should contain the "Word of God," i.e. in it God would be the speaker from beginning to end, as He is in the Qur'ān. In the Qur'ān we find God addressing man all through, whereas in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures it is as often as not man addressing God. The genuine Torah, or Zabūr (Psalter) or Injīl (Gospel), would thus, according to the Muslim idea, be similarly composed in verses of rhymed prose (*saj'*), in which God would be addressing man.

[60] Numerous examples of "sayings of Jesus" are to be found in Muslim theological literature.

[61] The regulation concerning the Qibla, or direction to which the Muslim must turn in prayer, is given in Sūra II, 136–140.

The Ka'ba, of course, in pre-Islamic days had been a pagan shrine, and there can be little doubt that many of the ceremonies thereat, the circumambulation, the kissing of the Black Stone, etc., which were taken over into the Islamic ceremonial of the Pilgrimage, derive from pagan practice, so that there is some color of truth to the charge that the Muslims venerate a pagan altar of sacrifice.

[62] Possibly this was a name used for the Ka'ba, though now the *Maqām Ibrāhīm* (which is mentioned in the Qur'ān in II, 119, III, 91), is pointed out as a special place in the sanctuary area, and has its own cycle of legends.

Let us for the moment examine the different passages of the Gospel which are relevant to your pretensions. Jesus Christ, as God, had no need of prayers, but as man He made them in order to teach us how to pray, even us whose nature He partook. But in His praying He said nothing of all that which you attribute to Him. On the contrary He said: "Father, if Thou shouldest wish to put this cup far from Me; but in any case, not My will be done, but Thine" (Lk. XXII, 42). He thereby gave evidence that He was really man, since it is necessary to believe that the Word of God was both perfect man and perfect God, so that whosoever deprives Him of one or the other of these attributes, also deprives himself of the hope of attaining eternal life. The truth of the Gospel and the fidelity of Christians are manifested by conserving intact in equal measure both those traits in Him which are the most eminent and those which are the most humiliating, for had those who preceded us been able, or if we had had the thought of introducing some changes into the Gospel, would not these humiliating traits have been suppressed? Jesus said: "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but the Father who dwells in Me, He it is who does the works" (John V, 19; XIV, 10). If then you believe that the Son can do nothing of Himself, you must also believe that the Father who dwells in Him is He who does the works. Similarly, if you believe in the fear which came over Him as He was being put to death alive, and the sweat with which He was covered, and which was not that of Adam, and of which He had said before His incarnation — "Thou shalt eat thy bread in the sweat of thy brow" (Gen. III, 19), and if you believe in the assistance given Him by the angels,[63] though this was not to encourage Him, but to dissipate the idea of His disciples that He was a mere man, such an apparition making them realize that He was in many respects above the state of a mere man; if, I repeat, you believe all this, you must also believe what He said in the same book — "No one takes from Me my life, but I

[63] The Qur'ān speaks of Jesus as having been "aided" by the Holy Spirit (II, 81, 254; V, 109), and as Gabriel was identified with the Holy Spirit (cf. XVI, 104), it was commonly said that Jesus had had angelic help and assistance, which is doubtless what is referred to here.

leave it of Myself; I have power to leave it and power to take it again" (John X, 18). Never did He say, as you pretend, that God sent Him into the world and that He returns to Him.[64] On the contrary He said that the Father who sent Him was with Him, and adds — "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world," and again, "I leave the world, and I go unto the Father" (John XIV, 28 and 31). As for you, in all these passages that I have cited, whenever you meet with the word "Father" you change it, and replace it either by the word "Lord," or by the word "God," and you think to be able to justify your position by thus doing. Meanwhile, among these shameful modifications you make in the Scriptures, there is one passage which you cite with some fidelity, though you put no faith in it. That passage is this, — "He who believes in Me, believes not merely in Me, but in Him who sent Me" (John XII, 44). The meaning of this is that it is not in His human and visible character that one believes, but in His divine character, inasmuch as He is the Word of God. Then He adds as follows — "He who rejects Me, rejects Him who sent Me," and "He who contemplates Me, contemplates Him who sent Me" (John XII, 45, 48). He was sent as a man, and He sent His disciples as God, saying to them — "The Father is greater than I" (John XIV, 28), that is to say greater than My human nature, for otherwise He would not have said a little later on, "I and My Father are one" (John X, 30). Similarly, in His prayer, that you yourself report, Jesus said, "That they may know Thee the only true God, and Him whom Thou hast sent, Jesus Christ" (John XVII, 3). In this passage we see Jesus Christ bearing the title of God. Had He been merely a Prophet, needs must He have said — "that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Moses with the other Prophets, and then Jesus."

[64] The reference is probably to the statement in the Qur'ān that Jesus was merely a "Messenger" (*rasūl*, V, 111; III, 43; IV, 156, cf. XLIII, 59), i.e. one sent, just as other Messengers had been sent, and to the passages (III, 48; V, 117) which refer to how Allah "took him to Himself." The Latin 315a states the objection that adoration of Christ is out of place since He Himself brought testimony "*dicens quod missus sit a Deo*," and quoting the promise in Matt. X, 32 about confessing before the Father those who would confess Him on earth, and His statement in John XX, 17 about ascending to His God and their God, as clear evidence that He did not think of Himself as God.

Put aside, then, all these idle tales, for the fact is that Jesus, perfect God, became, by the admission of a human nature, perfect man, to whom we attribute the humiliating expressions of Scripture, as applying to a man, just as the glorious expressions apply to a true God, as I have mentioned several times. Under the envelope of His human body He allowed Himself to be tempted by Satan, who, at the baptism of Jesus, when he heard the divine voice saying: "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," was seized with horror, not being able to make out to whom it was addressed. Meanwhile Jesus, by His fast of forty days, as by the voice divine, proved that it was He alone to whom the voice was addressed. Then Satan, the declared enemy of those who practise virtue, desolated and devoured by jealousy, approached the person of the Lord, and found in Him one who knew all that was passing in the mind of the Adversary, and who replied to him only by disdaining him as the enemy of humanity, refusing to reveal to him the mystery of His designs. But why have you not read what follows, how when Satan found his temptations useless he retired for the moment, and how angels approached the Lord and adored Him? Did the angels adore Him as a man? It would appear that it is only the truth that you flee, exerting yourself to create all imaginable obstacles so as not to recognize our Lord as God, presenting Him always as a mere man, comparing Him to Adam, who, according to you, was created immediately by God, without having parents.[65]

[65] The argument from here on is an answer to the Muslim objection that Jesus was a mere man, as Adam was. In the Latin 315a the objection is put quite simply, that Christ was in the sight of God such as Adam was, for He ate and slept as Adam did. This is again taken up there in 320b. The reference is to the Qur'ānic passage III, 52, "Jesus, indeed, is as Adam in the sight of God. He created him of dust (*turāb*)." To which the Latin 320d, 321a objects — "*Ponitis facturam de luto, quae contradixit Deo suo, et non custodivit praeceptum eius, similem Verbo Dei et lumini ipsius, qui non est factus, sed per ipsum facta sunt omnia.*" The *de luto* of the Latin probably represents the *min ṭīn* "of clay" of the Qur'ānic stories of the creation of Adam (VII, 11 etc.).

It would seem that Christians in their argument with Muslims used to make much of the fact that the birth of Jesus was without the agency of a human father, as is admitted in the Qur'ānic accounts of the Annunciation. A favorite Muslim counter-argument is that mentioned by Leo here, that if Jesus is to be ranked high because of His birth from a mother without a father, then Adam must rank higher still, for he was produced without even a mother being necessary.

As for His vivifying death, of which, as a matter of fact, you are not ignorant, you fabricate another imposture by saying that no one could put Him to death.[66] But I ask you, if Jesus were a mere man, according to your supposition, is it a thing incredible that a man should be able to die? Pay close attention and reflect on this. You accept with satisfaction all the humiliating traits in the life of our Lord, but you despise and reject all the glorious traits. I invite you, therefore, to direct your attention to some points of the Gospel in regard to this matter. John the Evangelist, speaking of Jesus, says: "He who believes in the Son has eternal life; but he who disobeys the Son will never see life, but the wrath of God dwells on him" (John III, 36). John the son of Zechariah says: "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" (John I, 29). Then John the Evangelist commences his Gospel with these words, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. It was in the beginning with God. All things were made by it, and without it nothing of what was made was made" (John I, 1–3). The Word of God itself, having come into the world in flesh, expressed itself in the following manner — "He who has seen Me has seen the Father" (John XIV, 9), "As the Father knows Me, so know I the Father" (John X, 15), "the Father (who has sent Me) is with Me" (John XVI, 32), "I mount to My Father and your Father, to My God and your God" (John XX, 17). He is His Father by His divine nature, our Father by grace, because "all those who receive Him to them gives He the right to be children of God, even to those who believe on His name" (John I, 12). He is His God because of His human nature, which He has in common with us. In His quality as being man Jesus was sent, and in His quality as being God, He sent His disciples — "as the Father hath sent Me, so send I you" (John XX, 21). Thus all the passages of the Gospels are in accord on these points.

With regard to circumcision [67] and the sacrifice,[68] you pretend

[66] Doubtless a reference to the famous passage in Sūra IV, 156, which replies to the Jewish boast that they had killed the Messiah, by declaring that they had not killed Him nor crucified Him, but only someone in His likeness.

[67] Since all Muslims follow the ancient Semitic practice of circumcision, though it is

that we have changed things, altering the former into baptism and the latter into the communion in bread and blessed wine. We have not altered or modified anything in these institutions. It was the Lord Himself who, in accordance with the prediction of Jeremiah, changed the type as laid down in the Old Testament and established the true law. Just listen to this prophecy. "Behold, the days come, saith the Eternal, when I shall make a new covenant with the House of Israel and with the House of Jacob, not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers on the day when I took them by the hand to bring them

---

not so much as mentioned in the Qur'ān, it was a peculiar grievance of theirs against the Oriental Christians that they did not follow this custom, and considered their baptism as a substitute for it. The Caliph al-Mahdī urges this against the Patriarch Timothy (Woodbrooke Studies, II, 28).

[68] The Latin 321c leads up from the sacrifice of the two sons of Adam, which is mentioned in the Qur'ān itself (V, 30), and so well known to Muslims, to the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist. Then in 321d, 322a he quotes the strange account of the Last Supper and institution of the Eucharist given in Sūra V, 112–115. His knowledge of the Qur'ānic passage is probably from oral tradition, and makes curious comparison with the original —

Cum discipuli Filio Dei dixissent, 'Invoca Deum ut dirigat nobis manna de coelo'; et dixisset Christus, 'Timete Deum si estis fideles,' discipuli dixerunt, 'Volumus comedere illud, et credemus tibi et sciemus quia verum locutus es nobis, et testabimur quia Christus Deus es: dirige manna de coelo, ut sit nobis festum solemne, et posteris nostris signum ex te: haec nobis tribue, quia tu es dator donorum.' Et Deus dixit, 'Dirigam illud vobis'; quod postquam negavit, cruciaverunt eum cruciatione qua nemo cruciatus fuit.

When the disciples said, O Jesus, Son of Mary, is your Lord able to send down to us a table from heaven? He said 'Fear Allah, if you are believers.' They said, 'We desire to eat thereof, that our hearts may be at ease, and we shall know that Thou hast spoken the truth to us, and we shall be witnesses thereto.' Jesus, Son of Mary, said — 'Allahumma, our Lord, Send down to us a table from heaven, which will be to us a feast, to the first of us and the last of us, and a sign from Thee. Do Thou make provision for us, for Thou art the best of providers.' Allah said, 'I shall send it down to you, but whoever of you afterwards disbelieves, Him will I punish with such a punishment as I have never punished anyone in the world.'

When he goes on to attribute this strange account of the Eucharist to a Nestorian instructor — "*Et tamen hi sermones fuerunt Nestoriani cujusdam haeretici, non sane de Christo sentientii, qui vos introduxit quasi ut aliquid de fide Christi intellegeretis, sed ut est ratio et veritas vobis non demonstravit,*" he is alluding once again to the commonly held idea that Muḥammad was instructed in religion by a mentor from one of the heretical sects.

out of the land of Egypt" (Jer. XXXI, 31). What covenant did He make with their fathers, if not that of which one is reminded by the blood of the lambs on the day of Easter, and which He had given to be kept in the midst of their people? (cf. Ex. XII, 21–28).

So if the Children, then, were preserved from destruction by the blood of an unreasoning lamb, could not we be saved from eternal death by the blood of the immaculate Lamb? Jesus Christ, before His passion, took bread, which He blessed and distributed to His disciples. He did the same with the cup filled with wine. These He called His body and His blood, and commanded that we take and drink thereof in remembrance of Him, announcing thereby His death as the sacrifice of the Lamb, innocent and pure, a sacrifice often announced in the Old Testament. The Holy Scriptures, which you certainly can never have read, give Jesus different names, e.g. the Word, the Son, the Ray, the image of God, the image of the servant, God, man, angel, the Pearl, the Bait, Lord of Lords, the Servant, the Lamb, the Sheep, the Shepherd, the eldest among Brethren, the eldest among the dead, etc. Did I recognize in you one who seeks only for justice, nothing would hinder me from giving for each of these names a detailed exposition, indicating their true sense, signification and extent.

Regarding circumcision, you pretend that we have replaced it by baptism. The mystery of circumcision, whereby God desired to treat of His covenant in this secret member and not in others more visible and glorious, remains unknown to you, it seems. Is it that you are also ignorant of the further circumstance, that Abraham before he was circumcised drew to himself the favor of God, and that he received the sign of circumcision only that it might serve as a sign of nothing other than his attachment to God? As for the principal reason why this secret member was chosen to serve this institution, you cannot know it, as I observed above. As for us, we have not received any command to circumcise our exterior members, but our heart, in a spiritual manner, as in the above cited promises of God announcing the reëstablishment of a new covenant. Indeed, if the true law of Jesus Christ, our Master, had not com-

pletely destroyed circumcision, as well as the Sabbath and the sacrificial system, what new covenant could He be promising? You, on the other hand, ought to be ashamed of the fact that at so modern a time as ours, when God has delivered the human race by breaking the bonds of the law, you announce yourself as a defender of circumcision, and in so doing have covered it with opprobrium. In the ancient law God ordered every male to be circumcised on the eighth day after birth, whereas among you, not only the males but also the females,[69] at no matter what age, are exposed to this shameful operation.

As for the divine institution of Baptism, it was announced to us by God long beforehand, through the Prophet Ezekiel, in these words: "I will pour out clean water upon you and ye shall be clean; I will cleanse you of all your uncleanness and all your idols" (Ezek. XXXVI, 25). This same baptism Jesus Christ commanded in His Gospel, saying to His disciples: "Go then, and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. XXVIII, 19). By this was fulfilled the prediction of the Prophet — "I have established thee as a light to the peoples" and "the people that was sitting in darkness has seen a great light" (Isa. XLII, 6; IX, 2).

Nor have we substituted Sunday for the Sabbath, as you pretend, without having reflected that among yourselves the Friday has been set as the day for reunion, without any reason being apparent that can justify the choice. As for us, we assemble on the day of the resurrection of our Saviour, who thereby has promised us resurrection, to say our prayers, and render thanks to the Creator for so great a mystery. This is the day

[69] Chahnazarian has a note about this charge of Leo's that among Muslims the females also are circumcised, saying that he had not been able to find any ancient author who tells of this, so that he judges that what is said on this matter in Greek and Armenian authors must be put down either to inexact information, or to prejudice and enmity. The practice is, however, well evidenced among Muslim peoples, though neither male nor female circumcision is referred to in the Qur'ān. In the famous story in the Arabian Nights, entitled "The Muslim Champion and the Christian Maid," for example, we read — "so he expounded to her the tenets of the Faith of Islam, and she became a Muslima, after which she was circumcised, and he taught her the ritual prayers." There is a discussion of the practice as applied both to boys and girls in the Musnad of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, V, 75.

on which the Creator at the beginning said — "Let there be light, and there was light." It was on the same day that the light of the good news of the resurrection of human kind shone forth by the resurrection of the Word and of the only-begotten Son of God in His human body. For the rest we have received no other command to cease work therein, or as the Jews, not to prepare our food. Yet for what reason do you, who manifest such incredulity, whether as regards the Prophets or as regards our Saviour, attach so much importance to the genuine traditions of the Christians? I imagine that it was for you and such as resemble you that God said by His prophet: "regard, you outrageous people, and you will be outraged and reduced yourselves. I am about to undertake in your times, a work at which you would not believe if one told you thereof" (Habak. I, 5).

Nor have I forgotten the objection raised by you in these terms: "How is it possible for God to dwell in the womb of a woman, in the midst of blood and flesh and dirt." [70] I sup-

[70] The objection to the incarnation is not generally put as grossly as it is by 'Umar, but it was a common objection. In the Latin 321a the objection is put — *quomodo Deus potuit ingredi in ventrem mulieris, tenebrosum et angustum et fetidum*, and the reply is given that the sun every day sends its rays down into all sorts of filth and ordures, yet far from being defiled thereby, it on the contrary cleanses everything. It then continues with the illustration of the "burning bush" (Exod. III, 2–4), adding — *nonne melius erat corpus Virginis quam illa spina rubi?* Very curiously the Latin thinks that Moses was given the Law from the fire in the bush, obviously confusing the call at Horeb to go and liberate the Children of Israel, with the flame of fire at Sinai at the giving of the Law — *qui ingressus in rubo qui erat in monte Sinai, et locutus est servo suo Moysi, et legem ei dedit.* This is the more curious as the Qur'ān keeps the two events quite distinct, the experience of the bush being at the vale *Ṭuwā* (XX, 9–35; LXXIX, 16), and the giving of the law at Sinai (VII, 138–142).

The objection, of course, arises from the indignant denial oft repeated in the Qur'ān, that the eternal God could have had a son, or daughters as the pagan Arabs asserted.

The Latin 319a quotes in this connection Sūra III, 40, where the birth of Jesus is said to be "a word from Him: His name shall be Messiah," but curiously says the announcement was to Zachariah, getting it mixed up with Sūra XIX, 7, the succeeding verses of which also tell of the annunciation to Mary. In 320a, again, in speaking of Mary as *Mariam quam elegerat*, there is apparently a reference to III, 37, where Mary is twice referred to as "chosen" by Allah. In 320c the reference to the Jews *dicentes blasphemiae verba ad Mariam matrem ejus, cui pudor castitatis inerat*, is doubtless to Sūra IV, 155, where the Jews are upbraided for having "spoken against Mary a grievous calumny." The writer, however, has slipped in his further reference — *et secundum vestrum sensum, Judaei intelligentes de Christo, persequentes et comprehendentes, eum*

pose that you know that there is a multitude of things God has created by His simple command, as Psalm CXLVIII assures us in these words — "He commanded and they were created. He has established them for ever and ever." Amongst these figures the sky with its sun, moon and other stars, celestial bodies, and the earth with its vegetation, and the animals. All these beings, it appears, occupy in your thought an eminently superior place, and seem purer and more precious than man, who, though considered by you as an impure being, was nevertheless created, not by a simple command, as these above-mentioned things, but by the all-powerful hand of God, and animated by His breath. Consequently human nature, created by the holy hand of the Creator, and honored by Him with resemblance to Him, cannot be a filthy thing in His sight. Do not, then, offer insults to the good Creator, in whose eyes nothing of all that has been created by Him is unclean, save only sin, which not only was not created by Him in man, but was not even ordained. On the contrary, there is nothing more precious than man, for whom all things were created. God then, who has so honored man by creating him in His image, would not think it shameful to take man's image in order to save him, since, as I have said, there is nothing unclean in human nature save sin, and all those things in man which you consider filthy, have been organized so by God for our good. For example, the menses of the female serve in the reproduction of the human species, and the evacuation of the excesses of food and drink serve for the conservation of our life. It is you alone who consider them impure, whereas in the eyes of God it is pillage, assassination, blasphemy and other such crimes, which are considered as defiling, rather than those things above-mentioned which are designed for the purpose of reproduction and the conservation of human life.

Beyond all that I have brought up so far, I have yet to observe to you another matter, namely, that if the bush flaming with divine fire at the time of Moses, was not consumed, man must be considered as more precious than a bush, and than all created things, for it is of holy men that God said: "I will dwell

crucifixerunt, for IV, 156 expressly states, "But they slew Him not, nor crucified Him, but only one in His likeness."

in their midst" (Ezek. XLIII, 7), and again, "In whom will I dwell if not in men kindly and humble, and in those who fear My words?" (Isa. LXVI, 2). It is here clearly to be seen that God calls just men His habitation, and that He is not offended by their natural infirmities, which you call filthiness, since it befits the ever-living to have a living temple.

I submit to you also the following proposition, and the more willingly, as I perceive you to be envious of the glory of the saints of God and their relics, that God declared to be His dwelling. If God cares for all the bones of the human race in view of the general resurrection, how should He not take special care for those of His saints, of whom He has more than once spoken in such glorious and majestic terms, above all of those who have suffered death in His cause? It is of these martyrs that the Holy Spirit says by the mouth of David that "every kind of death of the beloved of the Eternal is precious in His sight" (Ps. CXVI, 15), and in another passage: "The just has ills in great number, but the Eternal delivers him from them all. He guards all his bones, and not one of them is broken" (Ps. XXXIV, 19–20). The divine power that dwells in His saints affirms that their bones will not be broken, yet we know that a great number of saints' bones have been ground to powder or by the fire reduced to ashes. As for you, child that you are, occupied with things that are visible, you do not think of that at all. The Holy Spirit speaks further in another passage: "God is marvellous to His saints," and Solomon speaks in these terms: "The just will live eternally and will receive their recompense from their Saviour. Only in the eyes of the impious are they dead, for they enjoy repose" (Wisd. III, 1, 2; V, 16). I presume that you are not ignorant of that history of the uncircumcised stranger, whose corpse, so soon as it was cast into "the sepulchre of the Prophet Elias and had touched his bones, came back to life, and rose upon his feet" (II Ki. XIII, 21). Now, if divine power did not reside in the bones of the holy Prophet, how could those of a simple dead man be able to revive a corpse? Thus we see that the living God does not consider that He is defiled by dwelling in the tomb of a dead person, for God judges of men in a way different from our judgment. Yet

what respect for the saints could one expect from you, when I see you, even now, excited by a species of fanaticism worthy of a pagan, exercising such cruelties towards the faithful of God, with the purpose of converting them to apostasy, and putting to death all those who resist your designs, so that daily is accomplished that prediction of our Saviour: "The time will come when everyone who puts you to death will believe that he is serving God" (John XVI, 2). For you are far from thinking that in killing all those who resist you, you are putting yourself to an eternal death. It is thus that Muḥammad, your uncle,[71] acted aforetime, when on the very day he went to immolate the profane sacrifice of a camel, at the same time had decapitated a number of Christians, servants of God, and mingled their blood with that of the animal which was offered in sacrifice. Yet you are annoyed when we gather together the remains of the martyrs who have sealed the profession of their faith by their blood, so that we may bury them in places consecrated to God.

Further, in your letter are some words apropos of the Cross[72]

[71] The reference is to 'Umar's uncle Muḥammad b. Marwān, whom Leo would have known only too well, for it was he who in the year 75 A.H. = 694 A.D. led the summer campaign which resulted in the severe defeat of the Byzantines at Mar'ash, Leo's own home (Balādhurī, Futūḥ, 188). He was also the general governing Armenia under the Caliphate of his brother 'Abd al-Malik (ibid. 205), and under his successor al-Walīd I, and had the task of putting down the Armenian rebellion which took advantage of the insurrection of Ibn az-Zubair to make a bid for freedom. His cruelties and evil deeds in Armenia had already been dealt with at length by Ghevond earlier in his book.

[72] It was very natural for the Caliph to raise an objection to Christian veneration of the Cross. In Muslim tradition as to the Last Day we find an account of how Jesus will return before the end and become a Muslim, and among the particular acts He will then perform is that of breaking all the crosses, the reason, of course, being that the cross is an offence to the Muslims. We have early attestation of Christians being reproved for their veneration of the Cross.

The veneration of saints and relics, and the use of pictures and images, are part of the regular arsenal of later Muslim polemical writers, but they must have been subjects of controversy and discussion in Leo's day, when the Iconoclastic controversy was raging, so that it is not surprising to see them appear in the Caliph's letter.

The Latin 322a in dealing with this problem inserts the tale of Constantine's vision of the Cross in whose sign he should conquer, and the subsequent journey of his mother Helena to Jerusalem to seek out the Cross which the Jews had hidden, with the miracle whereby the true cross was revealed, and the Church was built over the sepulchre. The form of the legend as he gives it is very close to that discussed by Tixeront, Les Origines de l'église d'Edesse et de la légende d'Abgar (Paris, 1888), 170–174.

and pictures. We honor the Cross because of the sufferings of that Word of God incarnate borne thereon, as we have learned from a commandment given by God to Moses, and from the predictions of the Prophets. The metal plate which Moses, bidden by God, placed on the forehead of the pontiff or high priest, bore the image of a cross having the form of a living being,[73] and it is in imitation of this sign that we Christians sign our foreheads with the cross, as of the Word of God who suffered for us in His human nature. The Prophet Isaiah even indicates the wood out of which that Cross should be made, the sublime crown in which the Church for ever glories. "The fir tree, the pine and the box together, to render honourable the place of My sanctuary; and I will render glorious the place of My feet" (Isa. LX, 13). Solomon speaks thus of it: "Blessed be the wood by which justice is exercised" (Wisd. XIV, 7) and in another place says: "It is the tree of life for all those who embrace it, and who attach themselves solidly to it as to the Lord" (Prov. III, 18).

As for pictures, we do not give them a like respect, not having received in Holy Scripture any commandment whatsoever in regard to this. Nevertheless, finding in the Old Testament that divine command which authorized Moses to have executed in the tabernacle the figures of the Cherubim, and animated by a sincere attachment for the disciples of the Lord, who burned with love for the Saviour Himself, we have always felt a desire to conserve their images, which have come down to us from their times as their living representation. Their presence charms us, and we glorify God who has saved us by the intermediary of His only-begotten Son, who appeared in the world in a similar figure, and we glorify the saints. But as for the wood and the colors, we do not give them any reverence. But you, do you feel no shame to have venerated that House that is called the Ka'ba, the dwelling of Abraham, which as a matter of fact

[73] This is the *tsīts* of Exod. XXVIII, 36–38, and of which we have divergent descriptions by Josephus, Ant. III, vii, 6 and BJ. V, v, 7, and which, as evidenced also by Philo and the Letter of Aristeas, seems to have had on it the name of God engraved; but this idea that it had on it some foreshadowing of the crucifix, seems a Byzantine conceit.

Abraham never saw nor so much as dreamed of, in its diabolical arid desert? This House was existing long before Muḥammad, and was the object of a cult among your fellow citizens, while Muḥammad, far from abolishing it, called it the dwelling of Abraham.[74] In order not to appear to wrongfully give you offence, I shall prove (its diabolical nature), by passages from the Holy Gospel and from your own history. Jesus Christ often drove out demons into that very desert. "He (the demon) goes by the desert places" (Matt. XII, 43). These unclean spirits appear to you there sometimes under serpent form,[75] and sometimes they seem to indulge in evil relations with women, according to their custom, giving the appearance of making marriages. You, deceived by the illusion, and imprudently falling into the net, make yourselves their compeers here below and in the world to come, so far are you from understanding that in the other world it is forbidden them, by command of the Saviour, to have such commerce.[76] Jesus Christ fettered here below their revolting violence, and though, like their father Satan, they are constantly malevolent, yet they cannot openly cause harm to anyone, since if they dared to do this, or were able, they would inevitably have destroyed you as by fire in a single day. As it is they are able to do no more than draw you, by occult machinations, to the loss of your souls. For example, by means of a stone that is called *rukn*,[77] that you adore without knowing why; by means of that carnage of demons, from which the birds and the beasts flee with all haste and extreme aversion; by means of the stones cast, the flight,

[74] See note 62. This reply to the charge of veneration of the Cross etc. by a countercharge of Muslim veneration of the Ka'ba, is commonly used, as e.g. by John of Damascus in PG, XCIV, 769.

[75] The story of the serpent connection with the Ka'ba is curious, cf. Ibn Hishām (Sīra, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 122).

[76] He seems to be referring in this passage to the "jinn," who in Muslim thought have a kind of intermediate place between angels and men, being made of fire, whereas angels were made of light and men and animals of clay. These *jinn* are of two sexes, inhabit the space between the earth and the vault of heaven, take on various forms, and have relations with human kind, as is frequently illustrated by the tales of the Arabian Nights.

[77] This *ṙokounn* is the Arabic *rukn*, a name for the Black Stone, which is kissed by the pilgrims during the rites of circumambulation of the Ka'ba.

the having your head shaven, and other such ridiculous superstitions.[78] Nor do I wish to pass over in silence the abominable authorization given you by your legislator to have with your wives a commerce that he has compared, I am ashamed to say, to the tilling of fields. As a consequence of this licence, a goodly number of you have contracted the habit of multiplying their commerce with women, as if it were a question of tilling fields.[79] Nor can I forget the chastity of your Prophet and the manner full of artifice whereby he succeeded in seducing the woman Zeda.[80] Of all these abominations the worst is that of accusing God of being the originator of all these filthy acts, which fact has doubtless been the cause of the introduction among your compatriots of this disgusting law. Is there indeed a worse blasphemy than that of alleging that God is the cause of all this evil?[81] As for the example of David, who took Uriah's wife, as you remind me, it is well known that therein he committed a sin before the Eternal, for which he was grievously punished.

To sum up, the fact is that your legislator and all of you continue to resist the truth. In this you do well, for I know nothing worse than not holding sin to be such as it is, and that is

[78] All the references in this last paragraph are to the various ceremonies connected with the annual Pilgrimage. The "carnage of demons" refers to the sacrifice of animals at Minā; the casting of stones refers to the "stoning of the satans" on the 10th of Dhū'l-Ḥijja on the return from the visit to 'Arafāt; the "flight" probably refers to the traversing of the Wādī Muḥassir after leaving Muzdalīfa, for this passage is directed to be done in speed. The head is shaven after the pilgrimage sacrifice has been killed, and in a measure restores the pilgrim to the freedom of normal life.

[79] Sūra II, 223 — "Your women are to you as cultivated fields (*ḥarth*); come then to your cultivated fields as you wish, but send forward something for yourselves," a verse which greatly exercised the Commentators.

[80] *Zēdai* is apparently a mistake for Zainab, the wife of Zaid, the Prophet's adopted son, who divorced her that the Prophet, who had been attracted by her charms, might marry her. It is curious that Bartholomew of Edessa 1420b calls Muḥammad's sixth wife Zaιτé, which is very much the same as this Zeda of the Armenian text.

[81] What is in his mind is the fact that in the last resort the Muslim line of defence is that these things were commanded by Allah, who in the Qur'ān is represented as explicitly settling these matters, as for example the case of Zainab above mentioned. To the thought of the Muslim, of course, David's action with Bathsheba and Uriah would also have been under divine direction, since David was a Prophet, and it would seem as though 'Umar had made that point in his correspondence with the Emperor.

what you really do in never seeking nor receiving pardon.[82] In the Gospel God has commanded the husband not to repudiate the wife save for the cause of adultery, but you act quite otherwise. When you are tired of your wives, as of some kind of nourishment, you abandon them at your fancy. It had been my intention to conceal, if possible, the shamelessness with which you remarry, and how before retaking your repudiated wives you make them sleep in the bed of another.[83] And what

[82] Apparently there is here a reference to the characteristic doctrine of Fate, which holds that every action of man, even the least, whether of good or evil, was decreed before his birth, so that no act can really be labelled a sin to be repented of, since it was decreed beforehand that it should happen so, and what sense is there in seeking pardon for doing what we only did in accordance with Allah's decree?

The Latin 324a takes this up in somewhat different words — *si ita est, non est illi gratia si bonum operetur, neque peccatum si male operetur; quia non ille operatur, sed quod praescriptum et praeordinatum est illi antequam nasceretur. Nam si ita est, ut cuilibet homini sit praescriptum antequam nascatur, ergo Deus impie videtur egisse.*

The Qur'ānic passages usually quoted in this connection are LIV, 52, 53; XCI, 7, 8; XVII, 14, i.e. the passages concerning the decree, and the passages where Allah asserts that whom He will He guides and whom He will He leads astray (XIV, 4; XVI, 38, etc.). It is this question which is being raised by John of Damascus in PG, XCIV, 1589c, 1592a, and Bartholomew of Edessa (PG, CIV, 1393b) draws from this idea the conclusion that God must be held finally responsible for both good and evil, as in our Latin.

[83] The marriage laws of the Qur'ān are a frequent cause of adverse comment in the Christian polemical writings, as witness John of Damascus 769c and the tractate Contra Muhammad, 1452a. The charge of ease of divorce is based on Sūra II, 227 ff.; that of plural marriages on Sūra IV, 29; and the particular regulation that a man may not retake his divorced wife till she has cohabited with another man, on II, 230. The Latin 323a not only makes the point that this regulation in II, 230 violates both the Gospel, which says (Matt. V, 32; XIX, 9) that he who takes the wife put away by another is an adulterer, and the Law, where in Deut. XXIV, 1–4 the regulation is that if a man wishes to retake a wife whom he has put away he can only do this if no one else has touched her in the meantime, but on 322d makes the further point that whereas the Muslims have a law forbidding them to salute those of another faith (apparently referring to Sūra VI, 54), yet they are permitted to take wives of the women of any faith, and in refusing to pray at the grave of such a non-Muslim wife they are really going contrary to their own law, which in II, 59 declares that all who are faithful, to whatsoever religion it may be, are with God. The usual Muslim burial service, of course, assumes that the corpse is that of a believer, and could not be used for a person of another faith, but Leo's idea of refusal to pray at the grave of an unbeliever is probably based on the Qur'ānic passage IX, 85 — "Pray not thou ever over any one of them who has died, nor stand at his grave, for they disbelieved in Allah and His Apostle, and died while they were reprobates," where the prohibition was probably meant for that particular occasion (whether referring to the laggards at Hudaibiyya or Tabūk),

shall I say of the execrable debauchery which you commit with your concubines? For you are prodigal with them of all your fortune, and then, when you are tired of them you sell them like dumb cattle. It is said that the serpent has intimate relations with the *murines*, the reptile of the sea, but on arriving at the seashore the serpent spits out its venom before entering on its love affair. But you are more venomous than the serpent, never putting any limits to your bad faith, and not being able to satisfy your unleashed passions while still alive, at the hour of your death you violently put to death your wives, following the inspiration of the evil spirit.

In speaking of Satan and the souls of the just, you pretend that we have represented the former as the treasurer of God. That is an error. We say, on the contrary, that Satan was most happy at seeing humanity, in the horror caused it by death, plunge into the depths of despair, for he believed the just to be abandoned by God, and lost after death. Filled with this thought, and struck by the extreme humiliation of Christ, He believed that He also would be subject to the condition of men, and so incited His disciple to betray Him, and the Jews to put Him to death. But when he saw the Saviour walk willingly towards the sufferings of the cross, he was seized with horror, and in order to hinder the salvation of the human race, he attempted to terrify by remorse the wife of the judge (Pilate). In spite of his artifices, however, the Word of God tasted death in His human nature, while remaining in His divine nature always immortal, though inseparable from His humanity, and as true God engendered from true God. He rose again, or rather resuscitated His human nature, in accord with what was said by the Prophet David: "Let God arise and His enemies will be dispersed" (Ps. LXVIII, 1), and according to another prediction made by one of the twelve Prophets.

The Word of God being thus resuscitated, less for Himself, since He was Spirit, immortal and incorruptible, than for the human race whose nature He had taken upon Himself, He assured by this resurrection the resurrection of men, and rendered

---

and referred to Muḥammad's participating in the pagan Arabian customs connected with burial, but has been taken as a prohibition of general import.

certain the hope that the dead, delivered from the influence of the spiritual enemy, will be reclothed in new bodies, since souls obtain many graces from the Creator by the incarnation of His Word.

It is thus then that Satan, enfeebled, lost and led along by his own despair, and that of his legions, sees himself at last reduced to the impossibility of leading any longer the world to those cults which are strange and contrary to the will of God. So he has nothing to expect but the punishment of the eternal fire.

Now it is time for me to explain to you this vision of Isaiah, where a rider appears to him mounted on an ass and a camel.[84] The sense is this. The aspect of the maritime desert indicates that it is your desert situated by the side of the sea, a neighbor to and a boundary of Babylonia. Presently the Prophet says that he sees two riders mounted the one on an ass and the other on a camel. Those two riders are really only one and the same, as the Prophet himself clearly affirms in the passage itself. Under the name of "ass" the Prophet means the Jewish people, which, although it has read the Law and the prophecies, yet influenced by the teaching of Satan, has refused to submit and accept the Gospel destined to save the universe. It is this disobedience of the Jewish people that the same Prophet complains of at the commencement of his book — "The ox knows his owner, and the ass the crib of his master, but Israel has not known" (Isa. I, 3). Under the name "camel," the Prophet designates the Midianites and the Babylonians, because among you these animals are very common. And the same enemy who led the Jews into error, under the pretext of conserving the Law, has made you also fall into idolatry. I have said above that

[84] The passage is Isa. XXI, 6, 7 as it stands in the Peshitta text, and in it the Caliph is advancing one of the most famous cases of Old Testament passages in which the Muslims have found prophecies of the coming of Muḥammad. Their case is that the watchman in his vision sees two prophets who are yet to come, and hears a great and long speech. The one whom he sees riding on an ass is Jesus, and was fulfilled at the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem (Matt. XXI), while the one riding on a camel is Muḥammad, and was fulfilled at the Hijra, when Muḥammad left unbelieving Mecca and went by camel to Madīna, where he organized his community. The great and long speech is a reference to the Qur'ān, the sublime eloquence of which Muḥammad was to bring to his people.

the two riders really represent only one and the same man, as the Prophet lets us know immediately after by saying: "I saw the same horseman who came mounted on two steeds. Lo, the horseman who appeared two before was only one, and mounted on two horses."[85] He designates by these two horses the Jews and the pagans dominated by him. Whence then comes this man? What does he say? He comes mounted on two horses, and cries at the top of his voice — "Babylon is fallen, and its works have been overturned." It was then the enemy who deplored its desolation, and who, not finding any refuge other than your desert, has led to you the two horses of his iniquity, that is to say, the inconstancy of the Jews and the debauchery of the pagans. By the aid of these two elements he finally succeeded, by occult means rather than by the exercise of force, in drawing you into his error. It is thus that he has got you to circumcise yourselves, yet without admitting the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, the creators and sanctifiers.

As for divination and knowledge of the future, and as to demons who lead only to the torments of hell,[86] you have the same faith in them as the pagans, whose abominable debaucheries are familiar to you. You call "the Way of God" [87] these devastating raids which bring death and captivity to all peoples. Behold your religion and its recompence. Behold your glory, ye who pretend to live an angelic life. As for us, instructed in and convinced of the marvellous mystery of our redemption, we hope, after our resurrection, to enjoy the celestial kingdom, so we are submissive to the doctrines of the Gospel, and wait humbly for a happiness such that "eyes have never seen it, nor ears ever heard it, but which God has prepared for those who love Him" (I Cor. II, 9). We do not hope to find there springs of wine, honey or milk. We do not expect to enjoy there commerce with women who remain for ever virgin, and to have children by them, for we put no faith in such silly tales engen-

[85] This is a very free paraphrase of the LXX text, taking first the *ἀναβάτας ἱππεῖς δύο* of v. 7, and then the *ἀναβάτης συνωρίδος* of v. 9.

[86] Here again the reference would seem to be to the belief in *jinn*.

[87] This represents the Qur'ānic *sabīl Allāh*, and since Allah summoned the Muslims to strive and fight "in the way of Allah," the military expeditions for the spread of Islam were said to be *fī sabīl Allah*, whence the reference here.

dered by extreme ignorance and by paganism. Far from us be such dreams, such fables. "The kingdom of God consisteth not in eating and drinking" (Rom. XIV, 17), as saith the Holy Spirit, "but in justice," and "at the resurrection men will not marry women, nor women men, but they shall be as the angels" (Matt. XXII, 30). For you who are given up to carnal vices, and who have never been known to limit the same, you who prefer your pleasures to any good, it is precisely for that reason that you consider the celestial realm of no account if it is not peopled with women.[88]

Behold the short reply that I address to you. For the sake of our unshakable and imperishable faith we have endured at your hands, and will still endure, much suffering. We are even prepared to die, if only to bring to ourselves the name of "saint," a name precious and incomparable, as predicted by Isaiah: "You will bear a new name that the Lord will give you" (Isa. LXII, 2). The Lord Himself, when He was upon earth, told us beforehand of these sufferings, saying to us — "If they have persecuted Me they will persecute you also; if they have kept My word they will keep yours also; they will do all these things to you for My name's sake, because they have not known Him that sent Me" (John XV, 20, 21); and again, "you will weep and you will lament" (John XVI, 20). Jesus Christ in His prayer addressed to the Father, said: "They were Thine, and Thou didst give them to Me. . . . They are not of the world, as I am not of the world" (John XVII, 6, 16), "if ye had been of the world the world would love that which belongs to it; but because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, for that reason the world hates you" (John XV, 19).

Because such is our hope you continually menace us, you strike us with death, but we respond not to your blows with anything other than patience, for we count on neither our arm nor our sword to save us, but on the right arm of the Lord, and on the light of His face. Should He will it we are prepared to suffer still more in this world, so as to be recompensed in the

[88] This question of the "heavenly spouses" (Sūra XLIII, 70; XXXVI, 56; LV, 70 ff.; XXXVII, 47) was continually raised in the Christian controversial writings, as indeed, the whole Qur'ānic picture of a sensuous Paradise.

world to come. Yea, let Him fix the hour and the mode of the torture, we are ready prepared.

As for you, persisting in your tyranny and your usurpations, you attribute to your religion the success with which heaven favors you. You forget that the Persians also prolonged their tryanny for 400 years.[89] What was the reason for so long a reign? God alone knows; but surely it was not because of the purity of their religion. As for us, we accept with eagerness all the sufferings and all the tortures which can happen to us for the glorious name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, so that we may arrive at the happiness of the future world with all those who have loved to see the coming of the great day of Judgment of God, for the praise and glory of His well-beloved. May we be worthy to contemplate then with them the unique divinity of the Father, the Word His unique Son, and His Holy Spirit, now and for ever. Amen.[90]

The Emperor Leo sent this response by one of his intimate officers to 'Umar, sovereign of the Arabs. After having read it, the Caliph was very confused. This letter produced on him a very happy effect. From this moment he commenced to treat the Christians with much kindness. He ameliorated their state, and showed himself very favorable towards them, so that on all hands were heard expressions of thankfulness to him. As I have before mentioned, he gave entire liberty to the captives, and gave back to them their effects without demanding any ransom. He showed himself also much more generous to his own subjects than any of his predecessors. He distributed to the troops great sums of money, which till then had been stored up in the coffers of the treasury. After all these beneficent acts he died.

The question remains as to the genuineness of this corre-

[89] The 400 years of Persian tyranny must refer to the Sassanian rule, which lasted from 226 A.D. when Ardashīr succeeded in establishing the new national Persian dynasty on the throne in place of the Parthian Arsacids, till 652, when Yazdagird III was killed by the Muslims after the battle of Nihāvend. Since the rule of the Sassanians virtually came to an end during the Arab invasions during the reign of Ardashīr III (628–630), Leo's 400 years is a correct enough figure.

[90] This conclusion may be the padding of the monkish editor rather than the actual ending of the Emperor's letter.

spondence, and that really is a matter for the historians to argue on the basis of the material itself. The fact that both Byzantine and Oriental writers know of the correspondence, and apparently know of it independently, may indicate a probability that there was such an exchange of correspondence on religious matters, as well as that on political matters for which we have Muslim evidence. That we have no Muslim evidence as yet to this religious correspondence is no serious objection, since so much of the early Muslim material is still unpublished. One has only to think of the new light on many little points already shed by the recent start at the publication of the historical works of Balādhurī and Ibn 'Asākir, to realize that we might well find reference to this in Muslim sources were more of them available to us. However, even if it were established that there had been an exchange of such letters between the two potentates, it would not follow that this text of Ghevond is the authentic text of Leo's side of that correspondence. There are only too many instances of where enthusiastic writers have invented the text of documents they knew must have existed, so that Christian writers might quite as well have produced what they would have us believe was the text of Leo's letter to 'Umar, as Muslim writers have produced what they would have us believe is the text of Muḥammad's letters to the surrounding potentates.

We have to bear in mind, however, that we have a Latin text in the West, and an Armenian text in the East, neither of which is derivable from the other, and both of which obviously depend on a common body of original material. The Scripture quotations in Ghevond seem conclusive evidence that that original was in Greek, and the Armenian forms of some of the proper names also suggest that Ghevond read them, not in their Arabic form, but in Greek. While there is no denying that Ghevond has padded his material here and there, it seems clear enough that he was using an account of the correspondence and not creating it himself. To the present writer there seems sufficient evidence in his style to show that in these chapters he is translating and not freely composing as he is in the later chapters, though more profound Armenian scholars may disagree as

to this. A Greek original to provide a basis both for Ghevond in the East and the Latin in the West, could not have been composed very long after Leo's own time, if it were a later compilation and not the genuine correspondence.

The next step would seem to be to compare this material with the other correspondence of Leo on theological matters, but the present writer has no opportunity for that task, so he must be content for the moment to present this material as it is, in the hope that someone more fortunate may be able to make that comparison and add one more argument for or against its genuineness.

But whether it is the genuine correspondence of Leo with 'Umar or not, it is a sufficiently early document in the literature of Muslim-Christian controversy to provide extremely important evidence on the subjects of controversy and the methods of controversy prior to the well-known works of the later centuries, and as such is deserving of the consideration of students interested in that little explored but not unimportant branch of theological learning.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

By the editor's kindness I am permitted to present here some corrections and supplements to papers and notes previously published in this Review. I had hesitated to claim the attention of readers again for matters of minor importance; but justice to other scholars seemed to demand an additional word about some of the following topics, and the interest of the supplementary matter must be my excuse for reverting to the others.

Aeolus Figured on Colic Amulets

In a paper bearing this title (H.T.R. XXXV, 87–93), an interpretation was put forward which, while still defensible in part, requires some corrections. They should properly come from the scholar who called my attention to the need for them, Mr. Henri Seyrig; but his time is much occupied with his duties in the service of France, and in reply to my urging, he has pleaded his engagements and asked me to say what is necessary. I do so with the less reluctance because I can give full credit to the learning and acute observation of which he would make light if he were presenting the matter himself.

For several details I must refer to the previous paper, repeating here only the necessary points. A Copenhagen haematite, published by Eitrem and identified as a colic-amulet by the inscription *πρὸς κωλάνεμον*, shows a male figure standing in a slightly stooping posture, carrying a bag over his shoulder. On a Michigan stone, also a haematite, I found a similar design, in which, however, the man stands on a pedestal. I suggested that in both cases the figure represented Aeolus, the keeper of the winds, here debased into the rôle of a colic-demon.

A new light is thrown upon this design by Mr. Seyrig, who informed me (by letter, June, 1943) that it is derived from the "Marsyas" of the Roman Forum (really a Silenus carrying a sack of wine). Replicas of that statue were set up, in token of their status as free towns, in several places that had been granted the *ius Italicum*, and it appears as a reverse-type on coins of Neapolis Samariae.[1] That type is almost certainly the immediate source of the design on the Michigan amulet,

[1] Brit. Mus. Cat., Greek Coins of Palestine, p. 64, Nos. 118–120, with Pl. 6, 17–18, Pl. 39, 13; also Hill's introduction xxv, xxviii, xxix, xxxiii.

which came from Syria, and it is probably the source also of the slightly different design on the Copenhagen amulet. This derivation explains the fact that on the Michigan stone the figure carrying the sack stands on a pedestal, which the maker of the Copenhagen amulet omitted; consequently, my earlier suggestion that the colic-demon was supposed to have taken refuge on an altar must be abandoned. It also accounts for the presence of an eagle in the lower part of the field in front of the human figure, for the coins of Neapolis also have the bird in this position. It may even explain a strange geometrical design which appears over the eagle on both amulets, though in different forms; for Mr. Seyrig may be right in thinking that it is merely a schematic suggestion of the peak, or peaks, of Mount Gerizim, the sacred mountain near Neapolis, which is shown over the eagle on these coins.

Mr. Seyrig's brilliant observation raises the question whether any part of my interpretation remains valid; but I am glad to find him in agreement with my feeling that, notwithstanding the origin of the type, my conjecture about its use on these amulets is still tenable. An ignorant lapidary may have taken the figure on the coins to be in fact Aeolus, or he may simply have borrowed the type as a fairly satisfactory equivalent for the wind-god, and hence appropriate for a colic-amulet. I had suggested that the eagle, as a bird carrying a powerful magic, might have been intended for a counter-charm to defeat the colic-demon. That is still a bare possibility; yet the eagle, as used on the amulets, may mean nothing whatever. It was on the coin-type that served as a pattern and may have been kept on the amulets merely because the maker saw no reason to omit it.

The Violence of Departing Demons

In a paper on "The Technique of Exorcism" (H.T.R. XXXVI, 47–49) I called attention to certain acts as typical behavior of demons about to be expelled from possessed persons. The demon speaks in answer to the conjurations of the exorcist; he tells his name or nature and the kind of evil that he works; further, he often marks his departure, either of his own accord or at the exorcist's command, by an act of physical violence. Examples of this last feature of exorcism were found in Josephus (A.J. 8.48), in Philostratus' Life of Apollonius (4.20), in the Acts of Peter with Simon (11), and probably in the story about the drowning of the Gerasene swine (Mark 5.10–13).

My attention was caught recently by a modern story of exorcism,

part of which resembles the narrative of Josephus so closely as to deserve notice. I had probably read it some years ago, but it unfortunately escaped my memory when the paper mentioned above was written. It is an Egyptian village story reported by Miss Blackman in her valuable book, The Fellaḥin of Upper Egypt (231 f.). The beginning of the story in no way resembles Josephus' narrative, but is of some interest for another reason. It relates that a young man became angry with his wife, who was cooking the evening meal, and broke a pottery water-bottle (*ḳulleh*) over her head. The water and pieces of the bottle fell into the fire and put it out. "The next moment he heard a voice (the voice of an 'afrīt) saying to him, 'You have broken the head of one of my children, so I will come into you [i.e. possess you]'. The young man thereupon became mad, and began to tear his own face, and strike all those who came near him."

This opening is obviously related to the first story of The Thousand and One Nights, The Merchant and the 'Afrīt, where it is told that the merchant unknowingly killed an 'afrīt child with a date-stone which he had tossed aside as he ate; whereupon the father appeared and threatened to take the merchant's life in punishment.

The modern story goes on to tell how a sheikh skilled in magic was called to drive away the evil demon. As a requisite for his operations he demanded a piece of a garment belonging to the madman,[2] with the aid of which he performed certain ceremonies, burning incense and reciting incantations. Little progress was made until an unfavorable influence had been detected and the place had been cleared of bystanders.

"The sheikh finally told the 'afrīt to leave the man, but he replied (of course speaking through the man), 'From what part of his body shall I leave him? May I come out through one of his eyes, which will then become blind, as a punishment for his breaking the head of one of my children?' The sheikh replied that he would not permit him to do this, but that he was to come out of the big toe of one foot. The sheikh then placed a ḳulleh on the ground, and said to the 'afrīt, 'I shall know that you have left the man if you knock over this kulleh.'

"Presently, as he continued reading his incantations, the sheikh saw a few drops of blood fly from the man's big toe toward the ḳulleh, which was immediately flung with a crash against the wall. The madman then sat up and said, 'Where am I? And who are you?' After a while he recognized all his relatives, whom he had not known during

[2] This is the *οὐσία* of the Greek magical papyri. For examples in ancient literature, cf. Eur. Hipp. 513 ff., Luc. Dial. Mer. 4.4, Apul. Met. 3.17.

the whole period of his madness. They asked him where he had been, to which he replied, 'I have been among the 'afārit.'

"Since that day he has been perfectly sane, and is now living happily in his native village."

In the passage from Josephus cited above, a certain Eleazar is said to have exhibited his powers of exorcism in the presence of Vespasian and his court. He applied his magical ring to the nostrils of a possessed man and drew the demon out through the sufferer's nose. Then, wishing to leave no doubts of his success in the minds of those present, he set a vessel of water a little in front of the possessed man, and commanded the demon to overturn it as he left his victim; which the demon was obliged to do. The Egyptian story shows that this traditional method of clinching the successful exorcism has kept its place in popular stories and beliefs current in the Near East.

Mark 6.20

The suggestion (H.T.R. XXXVII, 42) that ἠπόρει in Mark 6.20 should be taken in a dialectic sense, "raised questions," has been anticipated in a work which was barely known to me, and which, I must confess, I did not consult in preparing my note. This is the Lexicon Graecum Novi Testamenti edited by F. Zorell (Paris, 1931) as Part I, Vol. VII of a Cursus Scripturae Sacrae published under the direction of Cornely and two other members of the Society of Jesus. The entry was brought to my attention by E. R. Smothers; it is as follows:

ἀπορέω: quo me vertam nescio, dubius animi sum: πολλὰ ἠπόρει multas habebat dubitationes, Mr. 6.20; dubia propono, dissero [Arist. ed. Berol. p. 355 b 24, 1085 a 35 al.]: ita frt. l. c.

The compiler of the Lexicon put this interpretation forward as an alternative, and the plan of the work precluded discussion. Consequently, my note may retain a certain value, but priority in the suggestion belongs to Father Zorell.

My colleague J. E. Dunlap has given me another example of ἀπορέω in a like sense, Cic. ad Att. 6.1.18: Nam illud de Flavio et fastis, si secus est, commune erratum est et tu belle ἠπόρησας. The passage is important as showing that this use of ἀπορέω was not confined to the technical language of the schools, but had passed into the conversation of educated people.

H.T.R. XXXIV, 106

In Note 6 below the page cited A. D. Nock makes use of a memorandum supplied by me, which, as I now think, gives an erroneous interpretation. It concerns the inscription on the gravestone of a little girl, which was excavated at Terenuthis (Kom Abu Billu) by an expedition of the University of Michigan under E. E. Peterson. The inventory number is $\frac{10}{AH}$. The inscription is ЄICXIPЄNI LZ, which I had read, assuming an omission partly due to haplography, as *εἰς χῖρ⟨ας Ἰρ⟩ένι* (i.e. *Εἰρήνη*) *ἐτῶν ἑπτά*.

Some time after the publication of Mr. Nock's article, Mr. H. C. Youtie suggested that, except for LZ, the inscription might be a badly spelled proper name formed on the stem of *ἰσχυρός*. His experience with names found in papyri showed that there were several of that derivation. He also correctly observed that most of these gravestones bear only the name and age of the deceased. His first thought was that *Εισχιρενι* might represent *Ἰσχυρ⟨ι⟩αίνη*, an irregular equivalent of *Ἰσχυρίαινα*, a name which occurs a few times in papyri of the Roman period. It is not necessary, however, to assume that the second iota was omitted by a stone-cutter's error, for other names from this stem are made either with or without that letter; we find *Ἰσχυρίας*, *Ἰσχύρας*, *Ἰσχυρίων*, *Ἰσχύρων*.

It would be more surprising to find a nominative *Ἰσχυραίνη*, for *-αινα* would be expected. In P. Oxy. 1199, 4 we find the words *παρὰ Αὐρηλίας Ἰουλίας Ἀρποκρατιένι*, where the editors note "l. *Ἀρποκρατιαίνης*"; but this does not prove the existence of a nominative in *-αινη*. Mr. Youtie, however, inclines to the view that we have such a form on the Terenuthis stela (*ενι* = *αινη*). I prefer to take *Εἰσχιρένι* as an abbreviated form, such as is common in modern Greek, of a nominative in *-ιον*, *Ἰσχυραίνιον*, even though no actual example of that diminutive has been published. For the disappearance of *-ον* we may compare *πάλλι* (for *πάλλιον*) P. Mich. III, 201, 2, and *μαχαῖρι* for *μαχαίριον* in a magical papyrus (P.G.M. XIII, 647).

It is worth noticing that in Ms. D of Aristides, *Ἰσχύρωνος* appears as *εἰς χείρωνος* (Or. 48.47 Keil; Or. 24, p. 477 Dindorf).

My previous error may serve as a useful reminder of the Protean disguises in which chaotic orthography clothes proper names as well as familiar words in constant use.

The Transcendency of Divine Attributes

In H.T.R. XXV, 362 ff. there is a description of a gem belonging to the British Museum (No. 56489) on which is cut a youthful head of the Apollo or Helios type, possibly intended for a gnostic conception of Christ. The bevel and reverse bear the inscription *ὁ μείζων τῆς ὑπεροχῆς, ὁ τῆς δυνάμεως ἰσχυρότερος, ὁ τῶν ἐνκομίων* (l. *ἐγκωμίων*) *κρείσσων, μενναθ.* The last word seems to be a nomen sacrum upon which as yet no light has been thrown. The remainder of the text is a variant of a sentence in the hymn at the end of the Poimandres (Corp. Herm. 1.31); besides other variations from the Poimandres the stone omits *ἅγιος εἶ*, which stands before each of the three phrases. This text is also found in a papyrus published by Schmidt and Schubart (Berliner Klassikertexte, VI, 110 ff.). The following comment is suggested by several similar turns of expression, quasi-liturgical in character, that have come to my notice since I described the gem.

In the process of intellectualizing religious ideas, which grew in strength and importance from the fifth century before Christ on, it is evident that religious thinkers felt the need of setting the divine apart by denying to it certain qualities inherent in finite humanity. Even in Homer the gods are ageless and deathless; but reflection had to go much farther before divinity could be regarded as *ἀγέννητος, ἀόρατος, ἀχώρητος*. Similarly, when powers and virtues that may be found in man are attributed to God, they must be stated with an intensity for which even superlatives are inadequate. Thus it comes about that in the liturgical fragment that suggested these remarks the deity is greater than all supremacy, mightier than all power, surpassing all praise.

It is possible that this manner of characterizing divinity was particularly common in gnostic circles; but if so, it was only as a tendency which affected religious thinking in various schools. It was partly an effort to clarify and elevate the idea of deity by placing it beyond all measure and comparison. Religious enthusiasm also contributed its part by asserting the pre-eminence of its god over all other possible objects of worship. The following examples were gathered as they were encountered here and there. I have not searched for others, though it is likely that many could be added.

Hippolytus quotes or paraphrases Basilides as follows (Ref. 7.23.3): *ὁ μέγας ἄρχων, ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ κόσμου, κάλλος τι καὶ μέγεθος καὶ δύναμις λαλῆθῆναι μὴ δυναμένη. ἀρρήτων γάρ, φησίν, ἐστὶν ἀρρητότερος καὶ δυνατῶν*

δυνατώτερος καὶ σοφῶν σοφώτερος καὶ ὅτι ἂν εἴπῃς πάντων τῶν καλῶν κρείττων. Ibid. 7.24.2: τὸν ἀρρήτων ἀρρητότερον θεόν; 7.22.13, ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἀρρήτων ἀρρητότερον καὶ πάντων ἀνώτερον ὀνομάτων. Compare Ephes. 1.21, ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου, κτλ.

The love-charm of Domitiana to bring back Urbanus calls upon τὸν μέγαν θεὸν τὸν αἰώνιον καὶ ἐπαιώνιον καὶ παντοκράτορα τὸν ὑπεράνω τῶν ὑπεράνω θεῶν. The text shows strong Jewish influence, though probably not actually written by a Jew.[3]

Apuleius (Met. 11.29; p. 291, 8 Helm), of Osiris: Deus deum magnorum potior et maiorum summus et summorum maximus et maximorum regnator Osiris.

Novatian de trin. 2 (p. 9, ed. Fausset): Quid enim de eo . . . condigne dicas, qui est sublimitate omni sublimior, et altitudine omni altior, et profundo omni profundior, et omni luce lucidior, et omni claritate clarior, omni splendore splendidior, omni robore robustior, omni virtute virilior, omni pulchritudine pulchrior, veritate omni verior, et fortitudine omni fortior, et maiestate omni maior, et omni potentia potentior, et omnibus divitiis ditior, omni prudentia prudentior; et omni benignitate benignior, omni bonitate melior, omni iustitia iustior, omni clementia clementior?

Campbell Bonner

University of Michigan

[3] See Audollent, Defixionum Tabellae, No. 271, 8–10, and Wünsch, Antike Fluchtafeln, No. 5; both editors give the necessary references to earlier publications.

GAMALIEL'S SPEECH AND CALIGULA'S STATUE

"But a Pharisee named Gamaliel, a teacher of the Law highly regarded by all the people, got up in the council and ordered the men to be removed for a while, and then said, 'Men of Israel, take care what you propose to do with these men. For some time ago Theudas appeared, claiming to be a person of importance, and a group of men numbering some four hundred joined him. But he was killed and all his followers were dispersed and disappeared. After him, at the time of the census, Judas of Galilee appeared, and raised a great following, but he too perished and all his followers were scattered. So in the present case, I tell you, keep away from these men and let them alone, for if this idea or movement is of human origin, it will come to naught, but if it is from God, you will not be able to stop it. You may actually find yourselves fighting against God!'" — Acts V, 34–39 (tr. Goodspeed).

This famous speech has given commentators much to write about. Its exact date is not recorded, but it is placed before the death of Stephen, only a few months or at most a couple of years after the Crucifixion, that is, in 30 or 31. Confusion is caused by the fact that the speaker refers to Theudas and Judas of Galilee who came "after him, at the time of the census" — that is, in 6 A.D. — whereas Josephus tells us that Theudas was killed during the procuratorship of Cuspius Fadus, in 44 or 45.[1] Various suggestions attempt to explain away these anachronisms. Writers sometimes suppose that there was another Theudas who likewise was a rebel, perhaps in the last days of Herod the Great; but there is no evidence that such a man ever existed, and little can be said in favor of inventing him. It is more commonly suggested that the author of Acts composed the speech himself and that his confusion was due to a careless reading of Josephus, who mentions the death of the sons of Judas of Galilee a few lines below his account of Theudas.[2] Such an explanation implies that Acts was not written until after the publication of Josephus's Antiquities in 93 — unless the author really misread some other writer, now unknown, whom Josephus later used as a source. In either case, however, the theory fails to explain why the author of Acts, composing a speech out of his own imagination fifty or sixty years after the event, should make it center around these two obscure characters whom he remembered so vaguely and whose activities really came more than a dozen years after the speech was supposedly delivered, or why Gamaliel, whose

[1] Jos. Ant. xx. 97–98 (ed. Niese).

[2] Jos. Ant. xx. 102.

name can have meant little to Christians at that late date, should be selected as the speaker.

A much simpler explanation of these difficulties, but one which apparently has not found its way into the commentaries or histories, is that the speech was misplaced by the author of Acts. The paragraph preceding the speech, as the narrative now stands, tells how the Apostles were thrown into prison, but an angel opened the doors at night, allowing them to escape; when they resumed preaching the next day, they were again arrested and brought before the Sanhedrin; Peter defended their actions, and Gamaliel then delivered his speech. A few pages below, in Chapter XII, we read that when Herod Agrippa was king in Judea, from 41 to 44, James the brother of John was executed and Peter was imprisoned once more, but again an angel assisted him to escape. My suggestion is that Gamaliel's speech might better be inserted at this point. The speech would still be "Thucydidean," reporting what might or ought to have been said on this occasion rather than what actually was said; it would still contain an anachronism, for Theudas was not killed until after Agrippa's death; the sons of Judas of Galilee would still be confused with Judas himself; and many details — which are the work of the author of Acts in any case — would be out of place; but the anachronism would become a slight one which, like the confusion of Judas with his sons, can easily be explained. The proposed arrangement also suggests reasons why these men were associated with the arrest of Peter, and it throws new light upon events that are important in the history of Palestine and Christianity in the Apostolic Age.

The activities of Theudas and the sons of Judas of Galilee were part of a larger episode in the history of Roman rule in Palestine. In the year 40 a serious crisis arose in this turbulent province when Caligula ordered his statue set up in the Temple. Josephus tells us that "many tens of thousands" of Jews went down to Ptolemais to beseech Petronius, the Roman governor, not to carry out the order, and that "many myriads" protested to him again at Tiberias, offering to let him kill them and refusing to cultivate their fields.[3] The gravity of the situation caused Petronius to delay and, fortunately for him and for the Jews, Caligula was murdered (Jan. 24, 41) before the statue was ready to set up. Peace had been preserved, but all Palestine was in confusion, and Claudius decided to adopt a new policy toward the unruly province, ending the procurators and put-

[3] Jos. Ant. xviii. 263, 270, and in general, 261–273.

ting Palestine under the rule of a native client king, Herod Agrippa I. This man was the grandson of Herod the Great; he had already been put over parts of the old kingdom by Caligula; he had shown his courage and his devotion to Judaism by urging Caligula not to set up the statue; and immediately after Caligula's death he had rendered Claudius great services which demanded repayment. Agrippa was a Hellenized oriental, clever, ostentatious, unscrupulous, who followed in his grandfather's footsteps, striving to please both Romans and Jews. He proclaimed himself φιλόκαισαρ and φιλορώμαιος, and issued coins bearing his own picture beside that of Claudius; he always showed great deference to Roman officials; and at the time of his sudden and dramatic death he was celebrating games at Caesarea in honor of Claudius.[4] But at the same time he paraded his Judaism, ingratiated himself with extremists among the Jewish nationalists, started to build new fortifications at Jerusalem, and even held a great conference of eastern client kings at Tiberias.[5] The last two steps aroused the suspicions of the Romans, who feared that he was plotting a revolution against them.[6] Agrippa certainly was not foolhardy enough to go to war with Rome single handed, but the Parthians might perhaps have helped him, and the Romans were undoubtedly justified in suspecting his restless ambition. At any rate, after his death in 44 they reverted to the old system of government by procurators: Cuspius Fadus began to rule in 44 and was succeeded in 45 or 46 by Tiberius Alexander, who apparently held office until 48. Other procurators followed until the great rebellion of 66.

When Agrippa reached Palestine, presumably in the late spring or early summer of 41, he found that Caligula's order had brought the country to the verge of revolution. Since Josephus was writing partly to defend the Jews before the Romans, he minimized their anti-Roman activities, yet his brief account bears witness to great nationalistic enthusiasm among them and to renewed Messianic agitation. Their refusal to cultivate the fields, like the communism of the earliest Christians a few years before, shows an expectation that

[4] Inscription quoted by V. M. Scramuzza, in F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity (London, 1933), Vol. V, p. 285, n. 5; see also, for Agrippa, ibid., Vol. I, pp. 14–25; A. H. M. Jones, The Herods of Judaea (Oxford, 1938), pp. 208–216; H. Willrich, Das Haus des Herodes zwischen Jerusalem und Rom (Heidelberg, 1929), pp. 147–157; and E. Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes (4 ed. Leipzig, 1901), Vol. I, pp. 549–564.

[5] Jos. Ant. xix. 326–334, 338–341.

[6] Jos. Ant. xix. 327, 341.

the appearance of the Messiah would soon render earthly possessions superfluous. Theudas apparently was a Messianic pretender: Josephus says that he claimed to be a prophet and refers to him as a γόης, a sorcerer or cheat, which expression he uses elsewhere for such pretenders; the phrase in Acts, "claiming to be a person of importance" (λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτόν) implies as much. Though Theudas was not killed until the time of Cuspius (44 45), he presumably began his agitation during the excitement of the year 40: his crossing the Jordan with his followers, described by Josephus, resembles a last despairing effort to escape the Roman cavalry rather than the first step toward a Messianic appearance. The sons of Judas of Galilee, like their father in 6 and their sons in 66, were Zealots seeking to drive out the Romans by force of arms. They too had probably been active since 40, but being defended by their Zealots, they were not captured and crucified until the procuratorship of Tiberius Alexander.

Agrippa's immediate task, therefore, was to restore order. Even though he and Claudius both hoped eventually to achieve a permanent settlement in Palestine by a more sympathetic treatment of the Jews, those in open rebellion and those announcing the immediate appearance of the Messiah must be silenced at once. The first to suffer were the Christians, who were likewise proclaiming the speedy establishment of the Messianic kingdom. Agrippa executed James, and later he arrested Peter. Though the year of these arrests is not recorded, scholars usually assume that they came toward the end of Agrippa's reign: the closing sentence of the story in Acts says that he then went to Caesarea and the next paragraph tells of his death there. But the whole first part of Acts consists of a series of quite disconnected episodes, and months or even years may have elapsed between the arrest of Peter and the death of Agrippa. The ancient chronology, as shown in Jerome's Chronicle, puts Peter's arrival at Rome in 42, twenty-five years before his martyrdom there in 67; and we shall presently see that there is at least one other slight straw of evidence suggesting that Agrippa's steps against the Christians were taken as early as 41. James may well have been executed within a few weeks of Agrippa's arrival in Palestine, with Peter's arrest following at the time of the Passover in the spring of 42.[7]

[7] Harnack argues for an early date, about 42, on the basis of several passages in apocryphal Acts, and especially in the Kerygma Petri (dated about 130), which report Jesus as having ordered his disciples to wait twelve years in Jerusalem and then go into the world. — A. Harnack, Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur (Leipzig, 1897), Vol. I, pp. 243–244.

Perhaps Agrippa's failure to arrest Theudas and the sons of Judas along with the Christians was due in part to the difficulty of capturing them — the Zealots were armed men, prepared to resist, while the Christians were preaching publicly in Jerusalem — but more probably it had a deeper cause in Agrippa's plans for ingratiating himself with the Jews. It was of course necessary for him to convince the Romans that he was acting energetically to restore order, but he had no desire to begin his reign by slaughtering a number of Jewish national heroes. Since the Christians were unpopular anyhow, his obvious course was to arrest and execute a few of them as rebels and report his accomplishments magniloquently to Rome. The more popular rebels could then be spared, if only they could be induced to refrain for a time from disturbing the public peace too much, and Agrippa might even enlist their active aid by convincing them that he shared their nationalistic ambitions. The Christians therefore suffered, but Theudas and the sons of Judas of Galilee were not hunted down until after Agrippa's death.

The story told in Acts harmonizes with these suggestions. It is recorded there that the execution of James pleased the Jews, which caused Agrippa to arrest Peter also; but a few verses below we read that Peter's execution was delayed until after the Passover, and that during this delay the angel helped him to escape. The Passover was apt to be a period of religious and nationalistic excitement, and Agrippa apparently feared trouble if he executed Peter, even though the Jews had shown pleasure at the execution of James. Perhaps all Jews did not share the same sentiments. The pro-Roman aristocrats may have been pleased while the populace was not; and if James was executed shortly after Agrippa's arrival in Judea, the king may not yet have learned the true feelings of the people, who resented having anybody at all executed by the Romans or their agents. A few months later, when he had learned the popular temper and had perhaps matured his plans for winning the Jewish nationalists, Agrippa put off the execution of Peter. It is not impossible, in fact, that he decided Peter's arrest had been a mistake and got out of a bad situation by deliberately conniving at the escape — that he sent an agent to smuggle Peter quietly out of the prison and that Peter decided this agent must have been an angel. Such an explanation of the alleged miracle seems more plausible than the suggestion, put forward by certain critics, that Christians had bribed the jailors. In such secondary matters as these, however, most of which are embroidered by the author of Acts, it is best not to spin theories too fine.

If my suggestion about the misplacement of the speech is well founded, it is here that Gamaliel comes upon the scene. Little is known about this rabbi, who looms larger in Christian tradition than in Jewish, but the Talmud indicates that he was an advisor to Agrippa.[8] Readers of Acts, in its present form, are sometimes perplexed by the fact that shortly after Gamaliel spoke in favor of toleration we find his most distinguished pupil, Saul of Tarsus, breathing murderous threats against the disciples and laying waste the church. A dozen years later the situation had changed. The Christians whom Saul persecuted about 30 were sectaries who attacked the Jews for crucifying the Messiah and who were thereby undermining Judaism. But if Gamaliel urged toleration in 42 he probably thought primarily of such Jewish enthusiasts as Theudas, and of the Christians only secondarily if at all. At any rate, Agrippa began to tolerate all the various Messianic groups: Theudas was not bothered and the Christians suffered no more. The whole policy was part of his program for winning the good will of everybody and especially that of the strongly nationalistic Jews. But while the policy was primarily Agrippa's, it may be that Gamaliel spoke on some occasion in its favor, and that rumors of his remarks reached the ears of Christians in a somewhat distorted form.

A final question concerns the means by which the alleged speech got into Acts. Chapter XII tells us that when Peter escaped from prison he first went to the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark, who is often identified with the Evangelist, and that after announcing his escape he went to another place. From the vivid details given in the story — even including the name of Rhoda, Mary's maid — scholars often infer that the author of Acts learned the story from Mark, probably by conversation at Rome. Or, assuming that this author was "Luke, our beloved physician" who, with Paul and perhaps others, made up the "we" in the "we document," he may have learned it while in Caesarea during Paul's imprisonment there. In either case he learned it in conversation and preserved it only in his memory or in brief notes made by himself. The origin of the other story of an imprisonment and escape — the one with which Gamaliel's speech is now associated — is still more obscure: he may have learned it through conversation or he may have had a written source. Somewhere he also picked up a story that once, at a time when Peter had been arrested and escaped from jail, the great Gamaliel had made a

[8] The Jewish Encyclopedia (New York, 1903), Vol. V, p. 559, s.v. Gamaliel.

speech urging toleration and saying something about some rebels named Theudas and Judas who were killed. And finally he learned an interesting and impressive story which showed that Agrippa's sudden death had obviously been sent by God. When writing the Book of Acts he put these stories together as best he could. Having no chronological guide, he confused the two arrests of which he had heard; his interest in the census, which he erroneously used to date the birth of Jesus, led him to confuse the sons of Judas of Galilee with their father, and thus to date Theudas too early; and he composed a speech for Gamaliel as he thought it might have been delivered. This speech, as we now find it, is not such first class history as are several parts of his book; but if we transfer it to Chapter XII, the story is not so bad as critics sometimes maintain. It is easy to see how Theudas and Judas came to be associated with the arrest of Peter; and it is not impossible that Gamaliel actually expressed views somewhat resembling those attributed to him, urging toleration for Christians as well as for Theudas and the sons of Judas of Galilee — who of course were not yet dead. Moreover, these suggestions regarding what actually happened have an important bearing upon at least four other points in the history of the early church.

(1) They show that there is no need to date the composition of the Book of Acts after 93 in order to give its author time to misread Josephus. There are, to be sure, two other passages in which critics have claimed to see traces of Josephus, but these traces are so slight that they would be ignored were it not for the Theudas and Judas episode.

(2) They emphasize the Messianic excitement of the year 40, which helped determine the subsequent development of Christian apocalyptic, though New Testament scholars rarely refer to it. The reason for this neglect is not far to seek. Critics once regarded the fall of Jerusalem in 70 as the fulfillment of Gospel prophecy; they then reversed the idea and regarded the prophecy as a *vaticinium ex eventu*, written after the fall of the city; and they still debate whether the "Little Apocalypse" in Mark (13: 14–23) was written before or after that catastrophe. This famous prophecy begins, "But when you see the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not," and foretells the coming of false Messiahs to lead men astray. The phrase "abomination of desolation" was of course taken from Daniel, where it referred to a statue of King Antiochus Epiphanes set up in the Temple. Caligula planned to do exactly what Antiochus had done, and Jews and Christians reacted to his attempt just as their Macca-

bean ancestors had reacted to Antiochus's. In 70, however, there was no question of such a desecration, for the Romans utterly destroyed the Temple. Moreover, the activities of Theudas and the sons of Judas in 40 offer an explanation of the false Messiahs mentioned in Mark. Critics have not given due attention to these events. Christian apocalyptic began with Jesus himself, but the excitement of the year 40 crystallized and gave form to ideas that Christians had been mulling over for more than ten years. The apocalyptic passages in the Gospels therefore had nothing whatever to do with the events of the year 70, and they do not prove a late date for the Synoptics.

(3) These suggestions help explain a great change in policy which came over the church at this time. Writers have often noted a second wave of Christian expansion after Peter's arrest and flight in the days of Agrippa, just as the Book of Acts itself attributes the first great expansion to the persecution culminating in the death of Stephen. Christian expansion now took on renewed vigor, it is true, but not because of Agrippa's persecution, which was neither long nor severe. The change might better be associated with the events of the year 40. For rather more than ten years Christians had then been expecting the immediate return of Jesus and the establishment of his Messianic kingdom. If they shared the high excitement aroused by Caligula's order — as seems to have been the case, judging from Agrippa's persecution, apocalyptic passages in the Gospels, and the subsequent activities of Christian leaders, even though the Book of Acts says nothing at all about their activities just then — it may have been the failure of the Messiah to appear at this time which brought the collapse of their early dream; it turned them from their first attitude of expectancy and convinced them that Christianity must be established throughout the world before they could expect the Second Coming. The celebrated Apostolic Council was presently held at Jerusalem, liberalizing the terms upon which Gentiles might become Christians; Paul and many others set forth upon their great missionary journeys; and Christianity was transformed from a minor Jewish sect into a world religion.

(4) And finally, these suggestions indicate that the events of 40 and 41 in Palestine may have had their repercussions in far away Rome, helping to determine the attitude of the imperial authorities toward Christianity. The Book of Acts records that Jews were expelled from Rome by Claudius; Suetonius's famous sentence says that Claudius expelled the Jews *impulsore Chresto assidue tumultantes* from Rome; Dio reports that there were too many Jews to expel, so Claudius for-

bade them to hold assemblies; and Orosius quotes both Josephus and Suetonius for an expulsion.[9] The first two writers give no indication of the year of this expulsion, but Dio records it along with other events of the year 41, and Orosius quotes Josephus as saying that it was in Claudius's ninth year, or 49. Unfortunately, however, Josephus contains no such passage, and if Orosius's memory failed him regarding his source it may have failed him again regarding the year. Dio's date is quite probable, but he gives no reason for the action. Since it was Claudius's general policy to placate the Jews everywhere, their expulsion from Rome was probably caused by a local disturbance which worried jittery officials in the period of tension following Caligula's assassination when the new regime was not yet firmly established. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that Dio's next sentence records the abolition of clubs (ἑταιρείας) which imperial officials often regarded as centers of sedition, but which Caligula had reintroduced. Suetonius was presumably referring to these same disturbances when he spoke of the Jews as *assidue tumultantes*; but whence came the idea that these riots at Rome were *impulsore Chresto*? Here Agrippa's connection with the affair appears, and these words are additional evidence that James was executed in 41. As suggested above, Agrippa probably sent Claudius a highly self-laudatory report of the death of James, telling how he, Agrippa, had suppressed the Jews who were causing disturbances and had executed their leader. Perhaps he mentioned Christ or the Christians by name, or he may have used the word "Christos" for any Messiah or, for that matter, for anyone raising a disturbance: when composing such a report Agrippa presumably was not scrupulously exact in his choice of words. The report arrived just at the time of the Jewish riots in Rome and someone happened to associate these Roman disturbances with those in Palestine and decided that they too were due to a "Chrestus" — the very misspelling of the name showing how badly it was understood. Roman officials thus came to regard Christians as potentially seditious.

Joseph Ward Swain

University of Illinois

[9] Acts 18:2; Suet. Claud. xxv. 3; Dio lx. 6. 6; Oros. vii. 6. 15.

ON ATHENAEUS XIV, 639e–640a

L. Ziehen [1] has already observed that we have no certain evidence handed down to us concerning the exact name of the god to whom the festival of the Thessalian *Peloria* was dedicated and who was most probably a personification of Zeus. Most MSS of Athenaeus have Πελωρίῳ, and Πελώριος is therefore accepted as the likely version by most scholars; but the Codex Marcianus of Athenaeus has the dative Πέλωρι, and Eustath, Il. 1101, 12 f. has Πελωρός, the same name as that of the human messenger whose good news was said to have initiated the festival. Leake [2] published a unique bronze coin of Phalanna in Northern Thessaly which is preserved in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, and probably solves this question. The obverse of this much discussed [3] coin, which was issued in the late fourth or the third century B.C. when the native dialects were used everywhere in Thessaly,[4] shows the head of a bearded Zeus laureate or of a similar god, and has as his name]λορις.[5] There is only room 'off flan' for two or three missing letters at the beginning of this word in the original die. Under these circumstances the restoration [Πέ]λορις or, more exactly, [Πέ]λο(υ)ρις is, in my opinion, very probable, if not certain, ου instead of ω being a peculiarity of the Thessalian dialect.[6] If this restoration should be accepted, it would involve that the reading Πέλωρι in the Codex Marcianus of Athenaeus has to be acknowledged as the *lectio difficilior* in future editions of this author, and that the Thessalian name of the god in question was Πέλορις or rather Πέλουρις. Phalanna probably issued a coin with the head of this god because this city was closely connected with his cult, if the *Peloria* was not actually held on Phalannian territory.

F. M. Heichelheim

University College,
Nottingham

[1] Pauly-Wissowa, R.E. XIX, col. 396.

[2] W. M. Leake, Numismata Hellenica, 1856, European Greece, p. 88, No. 2 s.v., Phalanna.

[3] Cf. F. Imhoof-Blumer, Nymphen und Chariten, Journ. Intern. d'Arch. Num. XI, 1908, p. 75, No. 209; E. Rogers, The Copper Coinage of Thessaly, Num., Circular XXXVIII, 1930, p. 104, No. 458.

[4] For the spelling ο instead of ου or ω in Greek dialect inscriptions cf. now C. D. Buck, Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects, 1928, 2nd ed., p. 27 and p. 190 f., Nos. 27 and 33.

[5] Leake, loc. cit., read]ορις, but the λ is certain.

[6] Cf. with earlier bibliography E. Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik, I, 1934, p. 90, 184 f.; Buck, op. cit., p. 25.